Notice of Meeting

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 15 January 2018 - 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 Adegbuyega Oluwole, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Bill Turner, Cllr Dominic Twomey, Cllr Jeff Wade and Cllr John White

Date of publication: 4 January 2018

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

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

AGENDA

Use Classes and Planning Application Procedure

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Declaration of Members’ Interests

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

3. Minutes - To confirm as correct the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2017 (Pages 7 - 21)

New Planning Applications

4. 748-752 Green Lane, Dagenham RM8 1YT-17/01250/FUL (Pages 23 - 51)
5. 98 Longbridge Road, Barking, IG11 8SF- 17/01658/FUL (Pages 53 - 75) Abbey

6. 445-447 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham RM8 3UL- 17/01594/FUL (Pages 77 - 87) Valence

Advertisement Applications Ward

7. Town Planning Appeals (Pages 89 - 117) Abbey; Chadwell Heath; Eastbury; Heath; Mayesbrook; Parsloes; Valence; Whalebone

8. Delegated Decisions (Pages 119 - 148)

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

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

Private Business

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

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

One borough; one community; London’s growth opportunity

Our Priorities

Encouraging civic pride

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

Enabling social responsibility

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

Growing the borough

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

Well run organisation

- A digital Council, with appropriate services delivered online
- Promote equalities in the workforce and community
- Implement a smarter working programme, making best use of accommodation and IT
- Allow Members and staff to work flexibly to support the community
- Continue to manage finances efficiently, looking for ways to make savings and generate income
- Be innovative in service delivery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Class</th>
<th>Use/Description of Development</th>
<th>Permitted Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong> Shops</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><strong>A2</strong> Financial and professional services</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><strong>A3</strong> Restaurants and cafés</td>
<td>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><strong>A4</strong> Drinking establishments</td>
<td>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><strong>A5</strong> Hot food takeaways</td>
<td>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><strong>B1</strong> Business</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><strong>B2</strong> General industrial</td>
<td>General industry: use for the carrying out of an industrial process other than one falling in class B1. (excluding incineration purposes, chemical treatment or landfill or hazardous waste).</td>
<td>B1 or B8 [B8 limited to 500 sqm] State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8</strong> Storage and distribution</td>
<td>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><strong>C1</strong> Hotels</td>
<td>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><strong>C2</strong> Residential institutions</td>
<td>Hospital, nursing home or residential school, college or training centre where they provide residential accommodation or care to people in need of care (other than those within C3 dwelling houses).</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><strong>C2A</strong> Secure residential institution</td>
<td>Secure residential accommodation, including use as a prison, young offenders institution, detention centre, secure training centre, custody centre, short term holding centre, secure hospital, secure local authority accommodation or use as a military barracks.</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><strong>C3</strong> Dwelling houses</td>
<td>Use as a dwelling house by a single person or by people living together as a family or by not more than 6 residents living together as a single household</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| C4 Houses in multiple occupation | 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. | C3 (dwelling houses)  
State funded school for single academic year – see footnote 2 |
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. |
| D2 Assembly & Leisure | 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. | 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. |

### Sui – Generis

**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.

**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 10.
- 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

### 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, 11 December 2017
(7:00 - 7:45 pm)

Present: Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Chair), Cllr Sanchia Alasia, Cllr Faruk Choudhury, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Adegboyega Oluwole, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Jeff Wade and Cllr John White

Also Present: Cllr Mick McCarthy

Apologies: Cllr Syed Ahammad, Cllr Saima Ashraf, Cllr Amardeep Singh Jamu, Cllr Bill Turner and Cllr Dominic Twomey

40. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

41. Minutes - 6 November 2017

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

42. 288 Dagenham Road, Rush Green, Romford - 17/00964/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to the application for 288 Dagenham Road, which was in Rush Green, Romford, and not Dagenham as shown in the report. The DMM stated that the property was at the junction of Dagenham Road and Fourth Avenue and consisted of an existing shop with flat above with a yard area to the rear premises. The application was seeking consent for the erection of extensions to the existing shop with flat above, including a two-storey side, first floor rear, and roof extensions incorporating side and rear dormer windows to provide an additional small retail unit and a total of three, two-bedroom flats and one, one-bedroom flat. The details of the design were set out in detail within the report. The site is surrounded by mainly two-storey houses within Fourth Avenue and Dagenham Road and a block of three-storey flats fronting Dagenham Road to the north of the site. The principle of such development in this location was acceptable.

The DMM drew attention to the objections that had been received, including the receipt of a petition containing 364 signatures, during the consultation process to the proposal.

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, the DMM advised that the design was proportionate and fitted comfortably on the site and, 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 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.

One of the pair of the existing garage to the rear of the building would be demolished to create four car parking spaces, thereby securing one parking space for each flat, which was 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. Photographic evidence showed that deliveries were taking place to the front of the current shop, which was preferable in view of the conflict that rear deliveries could create as this would involve vehicles passing through to a residential area.

The DMM advised that the fans at the rear of the shop were now not going to be moved, however, to meet the concerns of the Environmental Health Officer and to protect future residents from noise the DMM suggested the inclusion of the word ‘existing’ to condition 10, to read “The combined rating level of the noise from any machinery and equipment existing, relocated or installed...”.

The DMM reminded the Board that rights of access, and property devaluation were outside of the scope of planning control.

The Chair invited Cllr Mick McCarthy, Eastbrook Ward Councillor, to address the Board. Cllr McCarthy advised that he was representing the objectors including the 364 petitioners and advised that although the petition had been in the shop it had not been originated by the shop but had been arranged by local residents, including the Rush Green Residents’ Association, to support the existing shop tenants. Cllr McCarthy raised the lack of evidence for demand for another shop unit in the vicinity, as there was already an empty unit nearby and in planning terms we should not assume that there is a need for another unit. Cllr McCarthy was concerned that to provide another shop unit that may sit empty could create a feeling of deprivation to the area.

The Chair invited Mr Faiem Mansuri, to address the Board on behalf of the tenants of the existing shop at 288 and 290 Dagenham Road who were objecting to the proposals. Mr Mansuri drew the Board’s attention to the number of signatures on the petition and the access issues, in particular to the garage and rear of their building and that any changes to the access or the building would also need to be undertaken with the consent of the existing leaseholders, including any movement of air-conditioning units or external fans.

Mark Papworth, Dovetail Architects, acting as agents for the applicant, asked the Board to concentrate on the planning issues and responded to the
objections that had been made. Firstly, the petition did not have any heading / petition brief, as such it was unclear exactly what any of the signatories were supporting or objecting to and of those that had signed 206 lived outside of the Rush Green area. Two meetings had been held with the Borough’s planning officers to ensure that the design was of a high standard and acceptable under the Borough policies and London Plan and dealt with any concerns raised by highways and environmental health officers. The proposal would transform a derelict, probably rat and fox infested, piece of land into another small shop space and also create three more residential properties of good size.

Cllr Irma Freeborn supported the legitimacy of allowing anybody to sign a petition regardless of their place of residency. Cllr Freeborn asked if the tenancy for the properties was intended to be social or private housing and drew attention to the potential need to register the property as a social landlord. The Chair advised Cllr Freeborn that this was not an issue for planning consideration. Mark Papworth advised that whilst potential tenancy status was not relevant for planning consideration, for Cllrs information he understood that the Landlord was aiming for the flats to be let privately on short two-month notice leases.

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 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.

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 existing, 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
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.

43. Land adjacent to 95 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham- 17/01626/FUL

The Development Management Manager (DMM) introduced a report in relation to an application for a variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) in respect of planning permission 16/00535/FUL for the erection of a double storey rear extension to new dwelling, front porch and alterations to front windows.

The DMM advised that on 12 July 2016 (and not 2017 as stated in the report) planning permission 16/00535/FUL was granted for the “Demolition of existing extensions and erection of two-storey, two-bedroom, end of terrace dwelling” as an extension to the terrace on land adjacent to 95 Church Elm Lane.

The application sought to vary condition 2 (Approved Plans) in respect of planning permission 16/00535/FUL, which was 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.

Application 17/01626/FUL proposed the addition of a two-storey rear extension to the approved new dwelling, which was 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 three metres at first floor level. The proposed two-storey rear extension would project in line with an existing rear extension at the adjoining property, No.95 Church Elm Lane.

The DMM advised that the applicant had now corrected the roofline to the required hipped roof, which 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 Huntsing 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 was considered that the impact on neighbouring amenity would be acceptable. The DMM reminded the Board that an appeal at Grafton Road which retained a gap of about 11.5 metres was considered acceptable by
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 nine 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 was considered acceptable. There would not be any significant loss of light compared to the previous development on the site.

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

The DMM drew attention to the objections that had been received from residents of Crane Close who felt that the current development was not in accordance with the original drawings that they had been consulted on in 2016 and concerns about overlooking, particularly by the resident at No. 10 Crane Close.

To deal with concerns raised about further dormer windows being installed the DMM suggested the inclusion of a further condition that would remove permitted development rights and would requiring the submission of a further planning application should any further changes to the roof, such as gable end or dormer windows, be requested. The DMM tabled wording as a new condition 5: “Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Class B in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out on the house without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent significant overlooking and to maintain the outlook from neighbouring houses in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies.”

The Chair invited Ms J Jones who was objecting to the proposals to address the Board. Ms Jones drew attention to the objections and details already in the report and said that her objections were that the properties in Crane Close were not designed to have such a high and large building overlooking at the end of the gardens.

Ms Jones said that when the original planning application had been circulated in 2016, residents did not have any concerns as the proposal was then a two-bedroom house of a similar size to the original property, with a small single storey extension. If the residents had been aware at the time of the potential size the building could grow to then objections would have been raised. When the building works had commenced the building had been reduced to a shell and the foundations for the extension were added, taking up most of the garden of the original property. The works to the neighbouring property had also including dormer windows. The residents were concerned that it was the...
applicant’s intention to expand into the roof space or install dormer windows at No 95, which would significantly remove their privacy and allow direct view into the bedroom windows and gardens of the properties in Crane Gardens.

Ms Jones stated that the residents were not sent any letters or details of the requested change in planning. The letters had only arrived about the meeting tonight because of their complaint to planning officers.

The Chair invited Mrs Wills who was also objecting to the proposals to address the Board. Mrs Wills advised that she fully supported everything that Ms Jones had stated.

The Applicant, Mr Mazreku, advised that the building had been almost completed and he felt it was blending in well with the other properties in the area.

The Chair asked the DMM to clarify the alleged lack of notification to residents. The DMM advised that he had checked and could confirm that letters had been sent out to the immediate neighbours, but he could not confirm if they had been received. Ms Jones disputed that letters had been received by many residents including herself.

Cllr Alasia asked why the Applicant had not put in for permission for the design they had wanted from the outset? Why had they put in a full planning application and then decided to build it in a different way?

Cllr Mullane advised that Cllr Lee Waker had advised her that he had visited the site and has said that it was massive and in his opinion would impact on the neighbouring properties. Cllr Mullane felt that the applicants should be clear about what they want at the outset and follow procedures.

Mr Mazreku advised that the original planning consent (16/00535/FUL) had been granted in 2016 and was already in place when he had bought the property. The current application (17/01626/FUL) involved small changes to the original planning consent which was within the planning rules and process. Mr Mazreku said that the revised application would provide a larger two-bedroom house, which would provide enhanced living space for the residents, and in his view the house without the additional extension would have been a small two-bedroom.

The Board granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Class B in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out on the house without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent significant overlooking and to maintain the outlook from neighbouring houses in accordance with Policy BP8 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies."

44. 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 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 two, 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, two-bedroom end of terrace house – 33 Temple 
Avenue, Dagenham  
(Ref: 17/00858/FUL)  
Application refused under delegated powers 20 July 2017 – Whalebone Ward

Appeals Determined

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

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

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

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

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 dwelling house. 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

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

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).

45. **Delegated Decisions**

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 31 July to 5 September 2017.
This page is intentionally left blank
**Application No:** 17/01250/FUL  
**Ward:** Becontree

**Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:** The application relates to new dwellings without off street parking in an area which is not within a Controlled Parking Zone.

**Address:** 748 - 752 Green Lane, Dagenham RM8 1YT

**Development:** Demolition of existing two storey rear extension, residential conversion of existing upper floors and erection of part single/ part 3 storey side and rear extension to provide additional floor space to existing shop units, one additional retail unit and 4 one bedroom and 5 two bedroom flats.

**Applicant:** Eastern Iron Works Limited

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

**Summary:**

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 is 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 is 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.

**Recommendation:**

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

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


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.

1. Introduction and Description of Development

1.1 The site, at the junction of Green Lane and Waldegrave Road, comprises two shop
units within a parade of three storey shops with accommodation above. The second
floor accommodation is provided within the roof space. The shop units are currently
occupied by Superdrug and Cash Concepts, a pawnbroker. The upper floors are
associated with the ground floor shop units but are not currently in use.

1.2 The building (comprising Nos. 748 - 752) has an existing predominantly two storey
rear extension with flat roof that extends to the boundary of the site at the rear. (A
small part of the extension is single storey and a small element is three storeys in
height).

1.3 The site is surrounded by similar scale three storey development on Green Lane,
and on the opposite side of Waldegrave Road is a four storey church housed within
a former cinema building.

1.4 To the rear boundary of the site is a service lane that provides rear vehicular access
to the parade of shops. Beyond the service lane are two storey terraced houses on
both sides of Waldegrave Road.
1.5 The site has a hard paved forecourt between the back edge of the pavement and the building on Waldegrave Road with a width of approximately 3m.

1.6 The proposed development is to demolish the existing rear extension, and to construct a three storey extension to the rear, with a single storey element to the side that would accommodate additional retail floor space. The upper floors of the proposed extension, together with the upper floors of the existing building would provide 9 flats (4 one bedroom units, and 5 two bedroom units).

1.7 The ground floor extension would provide additional retail space for the existing end shop unit and a separate very small retail unit on the street corner that would have predominantly glazed elevations and is envisaged to be suitable for a use such as a café or florist.

1.8 The ground floor shop frontage onto High Road would be amended to incorporate a front entrance door serving the flats above.

1.8 Refuse and cycle parking storage would be provided at the rear of the building accessed from the rear service road. A secondary residential entrance at the rear would also be provided. The scheme would not provide any car parking within the site.

2. **Background**

2.1 No relevant planning history.

3. **Consultations**

   **Adjoining occupiers**

3.1 Consultation letters were sent to 38 neighbouring occupiers. One reply was received requesting further information, but no comments on the application were made.

   **Access Officer**

3.2 Requests various minor amendments to the internal layout in respect of matters such as corridor and door widths in order to improve accessibility. The applicant has submitted amended drawings that fully address these points.

   **Environmental Health**

3.3 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**

3.4 The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) for the proposed site, which has been determined using the standard methodology issued by Transport for London, is 2 which is deemed to be 'poor'. We consider this value to be representative reflecting the location of the site and its proximity to public transport services.
3.5 In addition, to the PTAL rating, parking stress surveys of the adjacent local highway network have been undertaken.

3.6 The cycle and car parking provision or prescribed vehicle parking standards within the London Plan that should be used to determine an appropriate level of car parking provision, should be consistent with objectives to reduce congestion and traffic levels and to encourage the use of walking, cycling and public transport. The site is not located within an established residents’ Controlled Parking Zone so there exists the potential for the residential units to generate parking demand that will overspill onto the adjacent local highway network.

3.7 To estimate the potential additional on street parking demand the applicant has used car ownership levels from the 2011 Census for the ward in which the site is located and based on the size of residential property in terms of number of bedrooms and the worst-case scenario has been used. Although, this method cannot be guaranteed to accurately predict the actual resulting on street parking demand it does provide an indicative value which suggests that the development would generate approximately an additional 8 vehicles. The parking survey concludes that these can be accommodated within the available reserve capacity and that relative to the on street parking demand in the vicinity the impact would be negligible.

3.8 The development proposals include dedicated secure and sheltered residential cycle storage, in accordance with London Plan standards.

3.9 It is considered that there are no adverse highway safety implications resulting from the proposed development.

Waste and Recycling Policy Manager

3.10 No objections.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

3.11 No objections.

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 £5,386 and £2,355 respectively.

5. Equalities

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity in the exercise of its functions. In this respect all of the proposed dwellings are designed to the Building Regulations Part M4(2) ‘Accessible and adaptable dwellings’ standard in accordance with London Plan policy.

6. Analysis
Principle of the development

6.1 The extension of the existing building in order to provide additional dwellings and a new retail unit in this location is acceptable in principle.

6.2 The proposed 9 flats would all be in private tenure, this is acceptable because the planning policy threshold for securing affordable housing applies on sites of 10 units or more.

Design

6.3 The proposed extension to the rear would be 3 storeys in height, therefore replicating the storey height of the main part of the existing building. The maximum height of the proposed extension would be 12.8m which is 1.6m higher than the ridge height of the existing building. In views towards the street frontage of the site on Green Lane the three storey rear part of the extension would not be visible as the existing building would screen the development. On reaching the junction of Green Lane with Waldegrave Road the three storey element would be visible.

6.4 In view of this relationship the proposed height is considered acceptable as it would not visually over dominate the original building. The visual relationship with the adjacent two storey terraced housing in Waldegrave Road is also considered acceptable given the gap, provided by the intervening service road, between the end of terrace house and the development.

6.5 In relation to siting, the proposed extension would sit forward of the building line of the adjacent terrace within Waldegrave Road. This is considered acceptable in respect of the resulting street scene, taking account of the change in the character at the north end of the road as it leads into the commercial Green Lane and in view of the taller and more prominent building of the church on the opposite side of Waldegrave Road.

6.6 In respect of the Waldegrave Road elevation, which will form the main public view of the proposed development, the ground floor would be fully glazed at the corner of High Road, with two window openings to the ground floor retail unit towards the rear part of the site. Above this, and set slightly back, would be the two floors of residential, formed of three staggered gable fronted bays punctuated with large window openings and balconies.

6.7 The non glazed elements of the ground floor would be finished in red brick with some decorative brickwork detailing indicated on the drawing. The upper floors would be finished in dark grey zinc panels. The panels would have vertical seams. The final details of finishes and colour of materials would be subject to approval of condition details.

6.8 The proposed new brickwork would reflect the character of the existing building and surroundings. The proposed zinc would be a much more modern and distinctive material in this location. The tone of this material may to some degree reflect that of the existing tiled roof of the main building.

6.9 The proposed design and materials of the extension are considered acceptable as it is well proportioned and would add visual interest to the street scene. It is
considered that the development is of an appropriate scale and design that would not conflict with the character of the existing building.

6.10 The ground floor Waldegrave Road elevation would be much improved, with the glazing providing additional visual interest and activity to the street. This compares with the existing ground elevation which is a blank brick wall.

6.11 In terms of the floor layout the scheme is considered well designed, making good use of the space, providing an internal communal roof level courtyard, creating interesting internal spaces, and optimising daylight, privacy and external amenity spaces to each unit.

Amenity

6.12 The proposed flats would each meet or exceed the standards set out within the London Plan in relation to accessibility; bedroom sizes, storage space, and overall floor space. The majority of the flats are dual aspect, the exceptions are one 2 bedroom south-west facing single aspect flat and two 1 bedroom south-east facing single aspect flats.

6.13 All units would provide external amenity space in accordance with the standards of the London Plan Housing SPG.

6.14 In addition to the private spaces a small landscaped courtyard would be provided at first floor level which also serves as a circulation space providing access to some of the flats.

6.15 The applicant’s submitted Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (prepared in accordance with the relevant Building Research Establishment guidance) indicates that the proposed flats would receive levels of daylight and sunlight that would be in accordance with the recommendations.

6.16 To ensure a satisfactory internal noise environment it is proposed that a condition be imposed requiring the installation of acoustic ventilators to habitable rooms facing Green Lane and Waldegrave Road in order to enable windows to remain closed whilst maintaining adequate ventilation.

6.17 In respect of neighbouring residents the extended building would be situated 9.8m to the north of the side elevation of 3 Waldegrave Road, the neighbouring property fronting Waldegrave Road. This dwelling is separated from the site by a rear service lane that serves the shops fronting Waldegrave Road. The extension would result in this part of the building increasing in height from 2 storeys to 3 storeys.

6.18 Whilst first and second floor windows and inset balconies are proposed that would face towards this adjacent house, the windows and balconies are positioned such that the line of sight would predominantly be towards its side elevation. This side elevation appears to include two habitable room windows. Given that these windows already face onto a public area, the rear service road, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any harmful loss of privacy. With regard to the rear garden of No. 3, the inset nature of the balconies and the window positions would largely block views from the development over this garden.
6.19 The residential neighbour to the east is an adjoining upper floor flat over the adjoining shop unit at No. 754 Green Lane. This flat has rear facing first floor windows (inset within the roof slope) and rear facing second floor dormer windows. The proposed development would be visible from the two second floor windows but would be largely screened by the existing roof slope from the first floor windows.

6.20 In respect of the two second floor dormer windows the closest would be approximately 3.5m from the development, and the scheme would result in this part of the building increasing from two storeys in height to 3 storeys in height with the additional storey being provided within the roof space of a pitched roof. This part of the extension would project approximately 10m to the rear of the rear elevation of this dormer window and would be of variable height due to the roof pitch. The relationship with the adjoining flat is considered acceptable in terms of outlook.

6.21 The submitted daylight and sunlight assessment also included an analysis of the impact of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight levels within the nearest neighbouring residential units of Nos. 754 and 756 Green Lane, and No. 3 Waldegrave Road. The assessment indicates that the scheme would result in a marginal impact on the neighbouring dwellings that is of a value defined by the guidance as having ‘no adverse effect’. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this respect.

Transport

6.22 The proposed development does not provide any car parking spaces within the site. Given the site constraints it would be very difficult to provide car parking and to secure an active street frontage to the building. Having regard to the transport officer’s comments it is considered that the lack of parking is acceptable and would not have a harmful impact on the amenities of neighbours or on highway safety.

6.23 It is proposed that the existing rear service lane be utilised to provide access to the bin storage areas and cycle parking, and this is acceptable to both the refuse officer and the transport officer. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in this respect.

Background Papers

- Planning Application File
- Local Plan Policy

Policy CM1 General Principles for Development
Policy CM2 Managing Housing Growth
Policy CP3 High Quality Built Environment
Policy BR9 Parking
Policy BR10 Sustainable Transport
Policy BR11 Walking and Cycling
Policy BR13 Noise Mitigation
Policy BR15 Sustainable Waste Management
Policy BC7 Crime Prevention
Policy BP8 Protecting Residential Amenity
Policy BP11 Urban Design

- **London Plan Policy**

  Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
  Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
  Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
  Policy 3.6 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
  Policy 3.8 Housing choice
  Policy 6.9 Cycling
  Policy 6.13 Parking
  Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
  Policy 7.6 Architecture

- **National Policy**

  National Planning Policy Framework
  National Planning Practice Guidance
EXISTING BUILDINGS

REFURBISHED RETAINED EXISTING BUILDING WITH ADDED GLAZED STALL

HALLEGRAVE ROAD

EXISTING BUILDING

NORTH ELEVATION PROPOSED
This page is intentionally left blank
Location of Site

98 Longbridge Road, Barking
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Barking and Dagenham Council
Development Control Board

Date: 15 January 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>17/01658/FUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral to DCB as set out in Part 2, Chapter 9 of the Council Constitution:
The application is recommended for approval and involves the construction of a first floor 2 bedroom flat without off-street car parking.

| Address: | 98 Longbridge Road, Barking, IG11 8SF |

Development:
Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension and first floor rear extension to provide additional floor space to serve existing health clinic and a 2-bedroom self-contained flat, with provision of first floor roof terraces and associated railings to serve existing and proposed flats, and creation of new window and door openings to existing flat.

Applicant:
Mr A Seibuti

Contact Officer:
Mark Sleigh
Title:
Development Management Officer
Contact Details:
Tel: 020 8227 3822
E-mail: mark.sleigh@befirst.london

Summary:
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 is 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.
**Recommendation:**

That planning permission be granted 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.
1. **Introduction and Description of Development**

1.1 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. There is a side access pathway to the north-east of the application site. 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 an additional 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.

2. **Background**

2.1 72/00837/TP – Installation of new shop front and alterations to provide shop on ground floor with self-contained flat above – Permitted

83/00134/TP – Erection of single storey rear workshop/store extension – Permitted

86/00396/TP – Alterations to shopfront to provide separate access to first floor - Permitted

11/00019/FUL – Alterations to front and rear elevations in connection to use of shop as private medical clinic (Class D1) – Permitted

16/00525/FUL – Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer windows and front rooflights – Permitted

17/01272/FUL – Erection of single storey rear extension to clinic - Permitted

3. **Consultations**

3.1 a) Neighbours/Publicity

Neighbours were consulted on 24 October 2017 and one response was received from the occupiers of 9 Cranleigh Gardens (located to the rear of the application site) raising objection for the following reasons:

- Loss of daylight/sunlight/privacy to rear garden.
- Loss of view.
- Disturbance and noise. Already suffered stress and noise pollution due to people living opposite neighbour building an extension.
- Borough is becoming overpopulated and many rear gardens converted to unsuitable accommodation. Council should prioritise conservation of green spaces.
- Overpopulating will cause health and safety risk.
b) Environmental Health Team

Potential for noise disturbance to be caused to residents of the proposed first floor flat from the normal operation of the dentists’ surgery. A noise control condition should be included.

c) Transport Development Management Officer

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

We have no objections to this proposal, with the following provisos:

- Confirmation from our Environmental Services that the refuse strategy for storage and collection are acceptable.
- Confirmation from our emergency services that the proposed extensions and dwelling can be reached and attended to in an emergency, especially by a fire tender.

d) Refuse Services

The refuse provisions are located to the rear of the property at 36 metres from the road, which exceeds the maximum distance for collection points. It is recommended to be within the limit of 25 metres.

There is no mention for the refuse provisions of the clinic in the D&A Statement; I understand it will have a separate secured refuse storage from the residential.

- Officer Note: The location of the refuse storage will not change from the existing. It is understood that the existing residents store rubbish to the rear of the clinic and move this to the front of the application site on collection days. This will also be the arrangement with the new flat.

e) Fire Safety

Access to the ground floor is considered acceptable. In the case of the proposed flat, there should be access for a pump appliance parked in Longbridge Road to within 45m of all points within the proposed flat, measured along a route suitable for the laying of hose.

*Officer Note: The above distance would be 47.5m exceeding the limit set by the Fire Safety Officer. Following discussions, the Fire Safety Officer agreed that the infringement was minimal and acceptable.*

4. Local Finance Considerations

4.1 The application is subject to both the Mayor of London and Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and would generate a Mayoral CIL contribution of £2,964.40 and an LBBD CIL contribution of £448.82 for the clinic and £5,558.49 for the new residential flat as it part of the Zone 1 charging schedule.
5. **Equalities Considerations**

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of its functions. The proposed new dwelling would provide suitable accessibility provision in accordance with Buildings Regulations M4(2) which would 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 application site is currently in use as a dental and medical clinic on the ground floor with a two-bedroom residential flat above. The extension to the surgery, which would provide two additional consulting rooms, is considered to be acceptable and, indeed, permission was granted for a similar proposal in November 2017 (17/01272/FUL refers).

6.1.2 The first-floor extension to provide a new flat is considered to be acceptable in principle provided that the quality and living environment for the proposed occupants is acceptable.

6.2 **External Appearance**

6.2.1 Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD sets out the principles which should be applied to the design and layout of new development in order to achieve a good standard of design.

6.2.2 There are minor external alterations proposed to the existing first floor flat including the creation of a new window and door openings for access to the proposed external amenity space. It is considered that these minor alterations are acceptable.

6.2.3 The proposed ground floor rear extension to the clinic would measure 11.1 metres in depth and would be similar in appearance to the existing rear extension. The first floor extension, whilst extending deep into the site, would not look out of character as there are similar large first floor extensions at 102 (Ariana restaurant) and 104 Longbridge Road (Great Commission Church) in close proximity.

6.2.4 The proposed external alterations are satisfactory in appearance and considered to be in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.

6.3 **Residential Amenity**

6.3.1 Policy BP8 of the LDF Borough Wide DPD seeks to protect residential amenity stating among other things that new development should not lead to significant overlooking (loss of privacy and immediate outlook) or overshadowing (loss of daylight and sunlight).

6.3.2 The proposed first floor rear extension would measure 17.2 metres in depth and would be situated 5.0 metres from the main rear elevation wall of the existing first
floor flat which serves a bedroom. The first-floor extension would have a shallow gable ended pitched zinc roof and would measure 6.5 metres in height. Although close to the existing flat above the clinic it is not considered that the extension would result in unacceptable living conditions. The proposal also involves the installation of a large new side window to the rear facing bedroom of the existing flat to provide extra light.

6.3.3 There would be a 22.2 metres between the rear wall of the proposed first floor rear extension and the existing rear wall of the residential property to the rear at No. 9 Cranleigh Gardens and 5.5 metres between the proposed rear elevation wall and the shared boundary with that property. Therefore, it is considered that this property will not be substantially impacted with regards to loss of light or enjoyment of their external amenity space.

6.3.4 Moreover, there are no rear elevation windows proposed to the first-floor rear extension and so there will be no issues with regards to loss of privacy to the properties to the rear. The proposed external amenity space for the existing and proposed first floor flats would also be designed to avoid any overlooking of the properties to the rear.

6.3.5 The neighbouring first floor flat at No. 96 does not have any external amenity space and only one rear elevation facing window. However, to avoid any loss of privacy from the new terrace for the existing flat to No. 96, the application proposes a 1.8 metre high fence on the boundary with No. 96.

6.4 Internal Design

6.4.1 In accordance with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards which is incorporated into the London Plan Policy 3.5, 4 person, 2 bed, 1 storey dwellings require a minimum gross internal floor area of 70m$^2$, including 2.0m$^2$ of built-in storage and at least one double bedroom with a floor area of at least 11.5m$^2$.

6.4.2 The gross internal floor area of the flat is 70.8m$^2$. The bedroom towards the rear has a floor area of 20.36m$^2$ and the other bedroom has a floor area of 15.77m$^2$. In-built storage is provided in excess of the standards (5.76m$^2$). The main bedroom and living room would have full height glazed sliding doors leading onto a proposed terrace. The general quality of the flat is considered to be acceptable.

6.5 External Amenity Space

6.5.1 Policy BP5 of the LDF Borough Wide DPD seeks to ensure that new dwellings provide appropriate levels of external private and/or communal amenity space. It states that a 2+ bedroom flat should provide at least 40m$^2$ of private, useable, functional and safe external amenity space. Policy BP5 accepts that in town centre locations it may not be possible to provide this level of external amenity space on site and that roof terraces and balconies may provide a suitable alternative. Furthermore, the London Plan Housing SPG sets a standard of 7m$^2$ for 2 bedroom 4 person dwellings.
6.5.2 The existing first floor flat does not currently benefit from any external amenity space but the proposal would make provision for a large external terrace measuring approximately 39 m².

6.5.3 The proposed new 2-bedroom flat would benefit from a terrace space measuring 12.23m² which is enclosed within the layout of the new flat and to which there is direct access from the larger bedroom and living room. The spaces would be useable, convenient and private. Therefore, it is considered that the provision of external amenity space for both the existing and proposed flats are acceptable.

6.6 Parking and Highways Matters

6.6.1 Policy BR9 of the LDF Borough Wide DPD states that the car parking standards set out in the London Plan will be used as maximum parking standards for new developments. In this regard, Table 6.2 of the London Plan requires that less than 1 car parking space is provided for 1-2 bedroom units.

6.6.2 The proposed development provides no car parking spaces. The lack of car parking is not contrary to policy but needs to be assessed to ensure that it would not have any adverse highway safety implications.

6.6.3 The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6a on a scale of 1-6 where 6 is excellent. The Transport Development Management Officer does not consider that there would be any adverse highway implications from the development and raised no objections. It is considered that the development, due to its location approximately 320 metres from Barking Station and served by a number of bus routes, is not likely to materially increase parking pressure within the immediate locality.

6.6.4 The same refuse storage and collection arrangements will be in place for the proposed flat as are currently for the existing flat and this is considered to be acceptable. The Fire Brigade have also confirmed that the site can be reached by a fire tender and raise no objections.

7. Conclusion

7.1 It is considered that the principle of extending the application property to provide additional consulting rooms for the clinic and a 2-bedroom self-contained flat is acceptable and broadly in line with the relevant Local Plan policies. The proposed development will provide satisfactory accommodation and additional space for the clinic and would have no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The additional parking demand for a 2-bedroom flat is considered to be minimal due to the location of the application site and its proximity to Barking Station and local bus routes.
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Page 61
Policy BP8 – Protecting Residential Amenity
Policy BP11 – Urban Design
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  Policy 3.5 – Quality and Design of Housing Development
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  Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance for Housing (2016)

  Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards
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  National Planning Practice Guidance
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Location of Site

445-457 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham
The application property is a ground floor commercial property 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 has 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.

**Recommendation:**

That planning permission be granted 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: Site Plan, Vehicle Access Plan.

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

3. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until there has been submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Authority and implemented in full, a scheme showing the installation of bollards spaced at 1.7 metres intervals on the boundary of the forecourt of the application site. The bollards shall thereafter be retained.

   Reason: In order to stop vehicles using the footway to drive onto the forecourt in the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety in accordance with Policy BR10 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

4. The use hereby permitted shall not take place other than between the hours 9:00am and 19:00pm Monday to Saturday and 10:00am and 16:00pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

   Reason: To prevent the use causing any undue disturbance to occupants of neighbouring properties at unreasonable hours and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

---

1. **Introduction and Description of Development**

   1 The application property is a ground floor commercial property which is currently vacant and was previously used without planning permission as a community centre and prior to this was 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.

2. **Background**

   2.1 89/00599/TP - Sub-division of existing Class A1 shop premises including the installation of new shop fronts to retain the use of two Class A1 units and change of use of one to Class A3 hot food shop on ground floor with 3 office units above – Permitted

3. **Consultations**

   3.1 a) Neighbours/Publicity

   18 neighbours were consulted on 19 October 2017 and a site notice was put up outside the entrance on 8 November 2017. No responses were received.
b) Transport Development Management Officer

Provided the proposed barrier is acceptable and it is conditioned, we have no objections.

4. **Local Finance Considerations**

4.1 The application is not subject to the Mayor of London and Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the proposal involves a change of use.

5. **Equalities Considerations**

5.1 The Equality Act 2010 requires the Council to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the exercise of its functions. This application does not have any implications for equality considerations.

6. **Analysis**

6.1 **Principle of Development**

6.1.1 Policy BE1 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD relates to the protection of retail uses. The policy seeks to retain A1 retail as the predominant use in the neighbourhood centre. Class A2-A5 uses are restricted to a maximum of 35% of the measured frontage of the neighbourhood centre. Although A2-A5 uses are the only uses specifically cited by the policy, uses which fall outside of these classes (such as the application proposal which is 'sui generis' (in a class of its own)) may also be considered against the policy as they have a similar impact to other non-retail uses.

6.1.2 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. The previous tenancy for Harmony Christian Centre was unlawfully taken up approximately 2 years prior to this current application and the tenancy has since ended.

6.1.3 Policy BE1 also states that exceptions may be made where it is shown that the A1 unit is no longer viable for retail purposes (and there is no reasonable prospect of reuse) despite attempts (over at least 12 months) to market it at values prevailing in the centre.

6.1.4 The applicant has provided details showing that the application site was marketed from 19 March 2017 until 13 November 2017 when the applicant took over the tenancy on a one-month exclusive period while the planning application is determined. During the marketing period of approximately 8 months, the property was marketed on Co-Star, Gumtree and Rightmove with an offer of £2,080pcm. The Council’s Property Services Team have stated that the offer is reasonable for a retail use in this location.
6.1.5 The owner has received offers solely from places of worship and has refused these due to concerns about the volumes of car parking and people that could be generated by such uses. The owners’ estate agents states that the only credible offer which has been received is that of the applicants.

6.1.6 Therefore it is considered that the applicant has demonstrated that the premises are not currently attractive to retail users and that, although the full 12 month marketing period has not elapsed, it is unlikely that a retail user would be found in the near future. On balance, it is considered that the proposed use is acceptable in the circumstances.

6.2 External Appearance

6.2.1 Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD sets out the principles which should be applied to the design and layout of new development in order to achieve a good standard of design.

6.2.2 The application does not propose any external alterations to the property with exception of creating space in the rear wall for vehicles to access the property from the rear. This would not impact upon the external appearance from the street.

6.2.3 The applicant has confirmed there will be vehicles parked on the forecourt of the site during opening hours and when the unit is closed. The vehicles will all be accessed through the rear of the shop and a condition is proposed requiring that bollards are installed at the edge of the forecourt to avoid vehicles accessing the forecourt from the footway.

6.3 Highways Matters

6.3.1 Following consultations with the Council’s Transport Development Management Officer it was made clear to the applicant that a vehicular crossover from either Becontree Avenue or Valence Avenue would not be acceptable in the future due to concerns regarding pedestrian and vehicular safety. The applicant has confirmed that vehicular access to the shop will be gained through the rear of the premises.

7. Conclusion

7.1 It is considered that the principle of using the shop as a car showroom is acceptable and broadly in line with the relevant Local Plan policies. The applicant has provided marketing evidence showing that the property has been marketed for a reasonable period of time at a suitable rent and that no offers from retail users have been made. The application property is a large unit with a frontage measuring 30 metres and is prominent located in the Andrew’s Corner Neighbourhood Centre. Its use as a car showroom would ensure the unit is occupied and does not remain vacant which can have a detrimental effect on the vitality and viability of the shopping centre.
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National Planning Practice Guidance
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DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD
15 January 2018

Title: Town Planning Appeals

Report of the Head of Planning

Open Report | For Information
--- | ---

Wards Affected: Abbey, Chadwell Heath, Eastbury, Heath, Mayesbrook, Parsloes, Valence, Whalebone

Key Decision: No

Report Author: Dave Mansfield, Development Management Manager

Tel: 020 8227 3999
E-mail: dave.mansfield@befirst.london

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 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

2. Appeals Determined

2.1.1 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 (see attached)

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 (see attached)
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 (see attached)

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 (see attached)

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

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 12 December 2017 (see attached)

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 (see attached)

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 (see attached)

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 (see attached)
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: 5th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3180626
7 Cecil Avenue, Barking IG11 9TA

- 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 Mrs Varsha Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00631/FUL, dated 12 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2017.
- The development proposed is conversion of existing house into a house in multiple occupations (No.5).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of existing house into a house in multiple occupations (No.5), at 7 Cecil Avenue, Barking IG11 9TA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00631/FUL, dated 12 April 2017, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ZAAVIA/7CA/101, ZAAVIA/7CA/102, ZAAVIA/7CA/103, ZAAVIA/7CA/104, ZAAVIA/7CA/105.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would result in an appropriate housing mix.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace residential property located adjacent to the junction of Cecil Avenue and Somerby Road. The site is surrounded predominantly by terraced residential properties, with commercial uses to the north west.

4. Policy BC4 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Document (BWDP) seeks to preserve family housing by resisting the loss of housing with three bedrooms or more. For proposed HMOs to be considered acceptable, Policy BC4 requires that the number of houses that have been converted into flats and/or HMOs (including unimplemented but valid permissions) should not exceed 10% of the total number of houses in the road, and that no two adjacent properties, apart from dwellings separated by a road, should be converted.
5. The Council have not advanced a case in respect of the remaining criteria set by Policy BC4 for proposed HMOs, which include consideration of amenity, local character, traffic and internal and external space provision. However, in general support of Policy BC4, the Council state that the Outer North East London Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) illustrates that 59% of overall objectively assessed housing need in the borough, between 2011 and 2033, will be required for family sized accommodation.

6. The Council have provided no evidence regarding the number of flats and HMOs at Cecil Avenue or within the surrounding area. The appellant states that the adjoining property at No 5 is in use as a 6 bedroom family dwelling and that there are no permitted HMO’s on Cecil Avenue. The appellant also states that records indicate that there are only flat conversions at Nos 1, 16 and 77 of the approximate 90 properties at Cecil Avenue. The Council have not contested the evidence put forward by the appellant. Furthermore, my site visit observations indicate that only a limited number of properties along Cecil Avenue are in use as either a HMO or as flats, and that No 5 was not in use as residential flats or a HMO.

7. Therefore the proposed development would result in an appropriate housing mix. Consequently the proposal would accord with BWDP Policy BC4, the requirements of which are set out above.

Other Matters

8. Whilst not a reason for refusal, the Council were unable to establish the minimum ceiling height for the proposed development. In addition, the submitted drawings do not indicate built in storage for future occupants.

9. However, based on my site visit observations and the floor space proposed for each bedroom, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide future occupants with sufficient internal living space, including storage space. Nor does the evidence before me indicate that the proposal would exacerbate local on street car parking to an extent that would be detrimental to highway safety.

Conditions

10. No suggested conditions have been provided by the Council. Nonetheless, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the above noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 8th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3188716
12 Fordyke Road, Dagenham RM8 1PJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Ms Y Trofimova against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/01094/FUL, dated 29 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2017.
- The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue
2. The main issue is the effect of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons
3. The layout of housing on Fordyke Road comprises two storey terraced blocks, of generally 6 houses, with each block separated by a modest intervening gap. This pattern is consistent on both sides of Fordyke Road and the majority of gaps remain unaltered. Notwithstanding the variety in appearance to the dwellings the modest gaps provide for a characteristic rhythm of development and avoid the street scene become a continuous terrace of development. The gaps afford a moderate but important sense of openness to back gardens beyond given the relatively tight arrangement of housing close to the highway.

4. No.12 Fordyke Road is the end property of one the terraced blocks. The appeal proposal would infill the gap to the boundary with No.14 Fordyke Road with a two storey form of development that would replicate the scale and massing of the host dwelling. Whilst No.12 has an existing single storey extension within this side space leaving a narrow gap for a side gate, the modest scale and set back position of this extension means that the characteristic pattern of development within Fordyke Road and the important sense of openness from the gap are maintained. This is also the case with regards to the flat roof ground floor side extension at neighbouring No.14. In contrast, and despite being slightly set back, the scale and position of the proposed two storey side extension with its proposed uninterrupted pitched roof would harmfully erode the openness of the characteristic gap and would conspicuously result in a continuous terracing effect to the detriment of the wider street scene.
5. I observed the few examples of two storey side extensions in Fordyke Road referred to by the appellant. I have very little information before me on their planning history and in any event the enclosing appearance of these developments does not persuade me that they should set the pattern for development on Fordyke Road.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to protect or enhance local character and create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place through their layout and design. It therefore follows that the proposal would also fail to accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

7. The Council’s decision notice refers to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012. In general terms I am not persuaded the appeal proposal would infringe the general design advice in this document at paragraph 5.4.2(a). However, I find that the particular circumstances at the appeal location mean that even a modestly set-back two storey extension within the remaining gap would be harmful for the reasons set out above.

8. The appellant submits that the appeal proposal would also provide an improved standard of accommodation for her family. That may well be the case but this benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer
Inspector.
**Appeal Decision**

Site visit made on 20 November 2017

by R A Exton  Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th November 2017

**Appeal Ref:** APP/Z5060/W/17/3181501

40 Cornwallis Road, Dagenham, Essex RM9 5NA

- 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 M Lovell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00291/FUL, dated 14 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
- The development proposed is described as demolition of side two storey extension, erection of two bedroom house link detached to number 40 and new extended drop kerb as shown.

**Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed

**Main Issues**

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: i) the character and appearance of the area; ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No 40 Cornwallis Road; and, iii) the supply of housing within the borough.

**Reasons**

*Character and appearance*

3. No 40 Cornwallis Road is a two storey end of terrace dwelling situated on a corner plot. As a result of its siting parallel to Cornwallis Road it is particularly prominent within the street scene, when compared to other dwellings which are set back. Nearby dwellings are of a similar appearance. Whilst a variety of single storey extensions are evident in the area, there are fewer two storey extensions. Consequently, the upper levels of dwellings, and particularly their roof profiles, show a high degree of uniformity and this significantly contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

4. Despite the erection of various boundary treatments and planting, the original layout of the area is still evident. As a result of No 40’s corner position, a large proportion of its private garden area is situated to the side of the dwelling. In combination with similar layouts on other corner plots, the symmetry of this arrangement also significantly contributes to the spacious character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would project into the side garden area of No 40 with its rearward most projection very close to the boundary fence. Its ridgeline would be set around 1.1m lower than the ridge line of No 40. Although the proposal would follow the building line of No 40, its uncharacteristic projection into the side garden would be disruptive to the distinctive layout of the area. The varied ridgeline would also appear uncharacteristic within the surrounding roofscape. Overall, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would be emphasised by No 40’s prominent position in the street scene.

6. I have had regard to the photographs of other developments in the area submitted by the appellant. However, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits based on the policies and evidence before. The other developments referred to do not lead me to a different conclusion.

7. In light of the above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy adopted in 2010 (‘the Core Strategy’) and Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document adopted in 2011 (‘the DPD’). These require development proposals to have regard to local character and distinctiveness which in this instance is defined by the Becontree Estate. It would also conflict with the Supplementary Planning Document, ‘Residential Extensions and Alterations’ adopted 2012 insofar as it relates to the requirement for side extensions to reflect the type of house and plot.

**Living conditions**

8. Policy BP5 of the DPD requires 2 bedroom houses to have a minimum of 50m² of private amenity space which is, amongst other things, useable and functional. The proposal would reduce the amenity space of the re-configured No 40 to around 41m². The resulting area would be triangular in shape and as such would have narrow areas unlikely to be useable or functional, thereby reducing the total useable area.

9. I note the appellant’s comments relating to the side gardens previous status and the amount of amenity space connected with No 40 in its original form. However, based on the limited evidence before me I can afford this only limited weight. I must assess the proposal in light of the policies and evidence before me at the time of the appeal.

10. In light of the above I conclude that the proposal would not provide an adequate standard of living conditions for future occupiers of No 40 and consequently would conflict with Policy BP5 of the DPD.

**Supply of housing**

11. Policy BC4 of the DPD seeks to resist proposals requiring planning permission which would result in the loss of housing with 3 bedrooms or more. Evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment provides strong support for Policy BC4 by identifying that 59% of new homes delivered in the borough between 2011 and 2033 are required to have 3 bedrooms or more in order to meet the housing needs of the borough.

12. I note the appellants comments on the contribution the proposal would make to smaller housing stock and the total amount of bedrooms resulting from the proposal remaining the same. This however is not what Policy BC4 seeks to
control. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in the loss of a house with 3 bedrooms or more and as a result would conflict with Policy BC4 of the DPD.

Other matters

13. I note the appellant’s comments regarding the proposals compliance with other policies, guidance and lack of objections. These however do not outweigh the harm I have identified above. I also note that changes that have been made to the proposal since a previous refusal of planning permission and the possibility of further discussion relating to the roof design in particular. These are not matters within the scope of this appeal and therefore I can afford them only very limited weight.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR
The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions
Site visit made on 12 December 2017

by Paul Freer  BA (Hons) LLM PhD MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 27 December 2017

Appeal Refs: APP/Z5060/C/17/3169925 & 3169926
Land and premises at 53 Winding Way, Dagenham, Essex RM8 2TD

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeals are made by Mr Karim Aminullah and Mr & Mrs Karim Aminullah against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 25 January 2017.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is, without planning permission, the erection of a rear extension in the rear garden.
- The requirements of the notice are:
  - Demolish the unauthorised single-storey rear extension or reduce the dimensions of the extension to those within Permitted Development tolerances.
  - Remove all waste resulting from the demotion or reduction of the extensions.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
- The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (c) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since the prescribed fees have not been paid within the specified period, the appeal on ground (a) and the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended have lapsed.

Summary Decision: the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld as corrected and varied

Procedural Matters

1. The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is, without planning permission, the erection of a rear extension in the rear garden. However, the first requirement at paragraph 5 of the notice is to demolish the unauthorised single-storey rear extension or reduce the dimensions of the extension to those within Permitted Development tolerances. There is, therefore, a mis-match between the breach of planning control alleged in the notice and the requirements to comply with it.

2. It is important that an enforcement notice is internally consistent. I must therefore address the inconsistency inherent within the notice. In this respect, the notice clearly relates to a single-storey rear extension to the property. The word 'single-storey' can therefore be usefully added to the breach of planning control at paragraph 3 of the notice to clarify the description and to correlate with the first requirement at paragraph 5. Similarly, in the interest of clarity and consistency, the word 'single-storey' should be added to the second limb of the first requirement at paragraph 5. The second requirement refers to the 'demotion or reduction of the extensions', in the plural, whereas the breach of planning control only relates to a single extension. The second requirement

https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate
should be amended to correct that minor error. The reference to ‘in the rear garden’ in the alleged breach of planning control is superfluous and can be safely removed. I shall correct the notice to incorporate those minor alterations. I am satisfied that no party would be caused injustice by so doing.

3. An accompanied site visit was arranged for 15:30 on Tuesday 12 December 2017. In the event, neither the appellant(s) nor a representative from the Council attended the site visit. However, I was able to view the extension from the public highway by looking over a gate to No 94 Bennetts Castle Lane. Given that the appeal on ground (a) has lapsed and that the appeal is proceeding on a legal ground only, I am satisfied that I was able to see all that I needed to from the public highway and that I do not need to gain access to the appeal property itself. I have therefore proceeded on that basis.

**The appeal on ground (c)**

4. The ground of appeal is that, in respect of any breach of planning control that may be constituted by the matters stated in the notice, those matters do not constitute a breach of planning control.

5. The appellants’ case on this ground of appeal is that the extension constitutes permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (GPDO). This Class permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse, subject to the limitations at Classes A.1 and A.2 and the conditions at Classes A.3 and A.4.

6. The limitation at Class A.1(g) is that, until 30th May 2019, development is not permitted by Class A if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would have a single storey and

   (i) extend beyond the rear wall of the dwellinghouse by more than 8 metres in the case of a detached dwellinghouse, or 6 metres in the case of any other dwellinghouse, or
   
   (ii) exceed four metres in height.

7. The appellant explains that the depth of the single-storey extension subject to the enforcement notice is some 5.6 metres, and therefore below the maximum depth for an extension to a terrace house permitted under Class A.1(g). The maximum height of the extension is stated by the appellants as being below 3.0 metres, and therefore also in accordance with the tolerances at Class A.1(g). The Council records the extension as having broadly these dimensions. On that basis, I am satisfied that the single-storey extension subject to the enforcement notice does not exceed the limitations set out in Class A.1(g).

8. However, development that is specifically permitted by Class A.1(g) is granted subject to the conditions at Class A.4. The first of these conditions, that at Class A.4(2)(a), is that before beginning the development the developer must provide information to the local planning authority relating to matters such as the depth and height of the extension. Upon receipt of that information, the local planning authority must notify each adjoining owner of the proposed development (Class A.4(5)). Where any owner or occupier of any adjoining premises objects to the development, the prior approval of the local planning authority is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises (Class A.4(7)).
9. The effect of the conditions at Class A.4 is that, if the enlargement of the dwellinghouse ostensibly in accordance with Class A.1(g) takes place without compliance with any of the conditions (as may be relevant) at Class A.4, that development is not permitted by Class A. The corollary is that, in order to qualify as permitted development under Class A.1(g), all of the relevant conditions at Class A.4 must be complied with before development commences.

10. The appellants have not demonstrated that the conditions at Class A.4 have been complied with. For example, I have no evidence to demonstrate that the details of the proposed extension were provided to the local planning authority before development commenced. Similarly, I have no evidence to show that the owners or occupiers of the adjoining premises were notified of the proposed extension and had the opportunity to object to it if so minded. Furthermore, without that information, I cannot be certain that the prior approval of the local planning authority was not required for the proposed extension. By not providing this evidence, the appellants have failed to discharge the burden of evidence that falls upon them on this legal ground of appeal.

11. On the information provided to me and on the balance of probability, I am not satisfied that the conditions at Class A.4 have been complied with. It follows that the single-storey rear extension subject to the enforcement notice has not been shown to constitute permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. For that reason, the appellants have not shown that the breach of planning control alleged in the notice does not constitute a breach of planning control.

12. Accordingly, the appeals on ground (c) fail.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice as corrected and varied.

Formal Decisions

14. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected by:

   - inserting the word ‘single-storey’ before the words ‘rear extension’ at paragraph 3 of the notice.
   - deleting the word ‘in the rear garden’ at paragraph 3 of the notice.

15. It is directed that the enforcement notice be varied by:

   - adding the word ‘single-storey’ after the words ‘reduce the dimensions of the’ at paragraph 5 of the notice.
   - deleting the letter’s’ in the word ‘extensions’ in the second bullet point at paragraph 5 of the notice.

16. Subject to those corrections and variations, the appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Paul Freer
INSPECTOR
This page is intentionally left blank
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3185168
75 Davington Road, Dagenham RM8 2LR

- 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 Darryl Mintah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/01072/FUL, dated 25 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2017.
- The development proposed is to create a double storey side extension to provide additional space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No.75 Davington Road is one of a semi-detached pair of two storey houses with the neighbouring No.77 Davington Road within the Becontree Estate, a large municipal residential estate constructed in the inter-war period. Compared to the terraced blocks of house elsewhere on Davington Road the layout at the appeal site is more spaciously arranged with a moderate gap between No.75 and the maisonettes atNos. 71 and 73 Davington Road and the larger gap on the bend of Davington Road between Nos. 77 and 79. Generally, the density and pattern of housing on Davington Road is tightly arranged such that the appearance and setting of the semi-detached appeal site provides an important degree of relief in the street scene. The original appearance and layout of the semi-detached pair is noticeable in both approaches along Davington Road.

4. I note that the two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and the ridge line set down so as to appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would however occupy the full width of the existing gap to the side of No.75 flush to the side boundary with Nos.71 and 73. The scale and massing of the two storey extension within this gap would harmfully erode the particular spaciousness provided by the appeal location as described above.

5. The appellant submits that a gap, generally larger than those found elsewhere on Davington Road, would remain. This would rely on no future enlargement at Nos. 71 and 73 but comparison to gaps elsewhere on Davington Road means generally very modest spaces between terraced blocks of housing. As set out
above the generous gaps around the semi-detached pair at Nos.75 and 77 respond to the curvature of Davington Road at this point and provide valuable spacious qualities in the street scene. Consequently, the partial enclosure of the existing gap at the appeal site would be significantly harmful to the original layout and appearance of this part of the Becontree Estate.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other side extension examples in the vicinity of the appeal site. The extensions opposite at Nos. 50 and 52 Davington Road are evidently not recent and I have no information before me on their planning history. Similarly I have few details of the examples in Lodge Avenue and Markyate Road. In any event the appearance of these developments, particularly the enclosing of the gap between Nos. 50 and 52, does not persuade me that they should set the pattern for development on Davington Road.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CP2 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 which recognises the Becontree Estate as part of the rich local history and requires development, amongst other things, to respect local context. It would also be contrary Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to respect local context, protect or enhance local character and create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place through their layout, function and design. It therefore follows that the proposal would also conflict with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

8. I have carefully considered the impact of the proposal, including the two storey rear projection of the side extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.77 having particular regard to outlook and light levels. Notwithstanding its location to the south of No.77 the modest scale of the projection and distance away from the side boundary would not adversely affect outlook or light levels to this property. The appellant submits that the appeal proposal would also provide an improved standard of accommodation for his family. That may well be the case but this benefit together with the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of this part of the Becontree Estate.

Conclusion

9. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer
Inspector.
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2017

by A Jordan BA Hons  MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3182043
141 Woodward Road, Dagenham, RM9 4ST

- 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 Kilbey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00523/FUL, dated 20 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2017.
- The development proposed a new two storey one bedroom house on the rear garden.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of new two storey one bedroom house on the rear garden at 141 Woodward Road, Dagenham, RM9 4ST in accordance with application ref 17/00523/FUL, dated 20 March 2017 and the plans submitted with it and subject to the conditions attached.

Main Issues

2. The main issues for the appeal are:
   - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area;
   - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjoining residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site forms part of the garden to No 141 Woodward Road, a modest terraced dwelling which lies within the Becontree Estate. The property sits on the corner with Ellerton Road and consequently has a large side garden which extends for some length along the Ellerton Road frontage. To the rear sits a more recently developed residential housing estate which is made up of a mix of dwelling types and this is distinct in appearance from the older terraced dwellings in the Becontree Estate.

4. The immediately adjacent No 84 Ellerton Road is a small detached dwelling with a front facing gable. The appeal proposal seeks to replicate the design of the adjoining No 84 within a plot at the end of the garden to No 141, and the scale, form and detailing of the dwelling would mimic that elsewhere within the

https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate
newer development. In this regard it would not appear intrusive or out of character and would sit comfortably within the street scene. The Council have raised concerns that the resulting loss of space within the street scene would erode the established spacious character of the area. However, I do not consider that this would be the case. The garden in question is relatively large and I noted during the site visit that throughout the adjoining estate, on corner plots, large extensions and ancillary dwellings are commonplace. Furthermore, corner plots vary in size throughout the estate. As a result, the development would not detract from a consistently regular pattern of open spaces and would not appear obtrusive. Instead it would be perceived as part of the adjoining infill development and so would be assimilated into the established street scene.

5. On the first matter I therefore conclude that the proposal would not detract from the established character of the area and would not conflict with policies CP2 and CP3 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which together seek development which protects and enhances the distinctive character of the area. It would also not conflict with guidance in the Framework which has similar aims.

Living Conditions

6. The proposed dwelling would be located at the end of the garden to No 141 Woodward Road, with rear facing windows facing onto the side boundary of the garden of Nos 139 and 137. These gardens are long and narrow, with various sheds and outbuildings located at the end, adjacent to the appeal site. The Council has expressed concerns that the proximity of the proposed dwelling would lead to a loss of privacy to those parts of the gardens. However, I note that the overlooking windows at first floor level relate to a bathroom and a secondary window to a bedroom, which could be finished in obscured glass, thus preventing overlooking. I also note that these spaces are already subject to indirect overlooking from the rear facing windows of existing properties. In this regard, I am satisfied that taking into account the length of the gardens and existing levels of overlooking, that subject to an appropriate condition the proposal would not significantly detract from existing living conditions.

7. The proposed dwelling would also be located in close proximity to the side elevation of 84 Ellerton Road. This has been extended at ground floor level and 2 windows on the side elevation face the appeal site, one of which relates to a hallway. The appellant has expressed concerns that due to the height and position of the proposed dwelling, it would lead to a loss of light and privacy to this window. The hall window does not relate to a habitable room and any effects in this regard would not significantly impact on living conditions. The second window provides an external source of light to the kitchen. I noted on site that light to this window would already be limited due to the boundary treatment erected on site. Furthermore, the floor plans provided indicate that the kitchen forms part of larger, part open plan, room and would receive borrowed light from the adjacent dining area. These factors lead me to the view that the proposal would not lead to a significant diminution of living conditions within the room.

8. I also noted on site that No 84 has erected 2 large dormers on either side of the roof. One of these faces directly onto the appeal site and contains 3
windows which would face directly onto the roof slope of the proposed dwelling. I have not been provided with floor plans of the accommodation within the roof storey or details of the permission relating to it. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that as the roof slope of the adjoining dwelling would slope away from No 84 it would not lead to a significant loss of light or outlook from facing windows. Furthermore, as the rear elevation of the proposed property would not extend beyond the rear of the adjoining No 84, I find no evidence that the proposal would lead to significant overshadowing of this garden.

9. In terms of the effect of the proposal on the privacy of No 84, the windows at ground floor level would effectively be screened from the development by the existing boundary treatment. The future provision of any upper floor windows would also be subject to permitted development restrictions. Lastly, whilst the provision of an additional dwelling would lead to additional activity, I do not consider this to be out of character for an established residential area and so would not be significantly harmful.

10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not conflict with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which seeks to ensure that new development does not lead to significant overlooking and maintains residential amenity.

Other Matters

11. It has also been put to me that although the site does not lie within a Conservation Area, as it forms part of the Becontree Estate it should be considered as having historical significance, which should be taken into account in assessing the proposal. In this regard the guidance in policies BP2 and CP2 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy is consistent with paragraph 135 of the Framework which advises that the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing such applications a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

12. I have outlined above why I consider that the character and appearance of the area would not adversely affect the spacious qualities of the wider Becontree Estate. As such, whilst I recognise that the Becontree Estate has some historic significance, I have no convincing evidence that the development before me would harm this, and find no conflict with policy BP2 or the Framework.

13. In coming to a view I have also considered whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers of the property. The Council are satisfied that internally the new house would be consistent with policy 3.5 of the London Plan and have raised no objection to the external amenity space provided to the new or existing property. I see no reason to dispute this view. Furthermore, I also concur with the Council’s assessment of the proposed parking as acceptable. Neither do I consider that the proposal would cause an unacceptable precedent, as I do not consider the effects of the proposal to be harmful, and furthermore, future development would be considered in relation to its own merits.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and subject to appropriate conditions would not harm the living
conditions of adjoining residential occupiers. I therefore conclude that the appeal be allowed.

15. In addition to conditions relating to the period of implementation and the approved plans, in the interests of ensuring a satisfactory appearance for the dwelling a condition relating to external materials is reasonable and necessary. In addition, in order to secure the privacy of those in adjoining gardens, a condition requiring that windows on the first floor of the rear elevation are finished in obscure glazing and have limited opening capacity are reasonable and necessary. The Council have also recommended a condition requiring that the property meets the requirements of the building regulations Part M, in relation to accessibility. Such a condition would not meet the test of necessity as this aim would be secured by building regulations.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR
Conditions

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

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 17/2/3/1 received 20 March 2017.

3) No development above ground level shall take place until details 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.

4) The windows in the first floor of the proposed dwelling’s north elevation shall be obscurely glazed to a minimum privacy level 3 and should not be capable of opening to an angle of more than 20 degrees. These qualities should thereafter be permanently maintained.
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Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 8th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3183929
146 Marston Avenue, Dagenham RM10 7LP

- 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 Terry Bowman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00453/FUL, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2017.
- The development proposed is single storey first floor extension.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue
2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons
3. The entrance into the short cul-de-sac at Marston Close passes between the two storey dwellings at Nos. 144 and 146 Marston Avenue. The layout of the corner plots of these dwellings pinch the entrance such that the narrow highway, including footways, passes between the boundaries of the properties parallel to the dwellings before forming a wider turning head cum parking area. The cul-de-sac then opens out onto a small amenity space around which the two storey housing on Marston Close is arranged. At the point where the highway passes between the houses on Marston Avenue, including at the appeal site, single storey side garages maintain a degree of openness both within Marston Close but also within the tight pattern of housing on this part of Marston Avenue between Stansgate Road and Rusholme Avenue.

4. The appeal site is situated at the northern corner on the entrance to Marston Close. The proposed extension at first floor level over the existing single storey side garage would extend to within 1 metre from the side boundary to the footway on Marston Close. Whilst the hipped roof would be slightly stepped down from the ridge of the host dwelling and the extension set in from the front elevation, due to its position and width, at the point at which the plot at No.146 pinches the entrance to Marston Close, the bulk and massing of the first floor extension would have a significant enclosing effect within Marston Close as well as within the wider street scene in Marston Avenue.

5. I recognise that the highway into Marston Close would remain open and that No.144 Marston Avenue at the corresponding southern corner plot, which is
similarly designed as No.146, has not been extended at first floor level. I also noted the scale, position and height of the existing single storey garage, the solid side boundary and various outbuildings to the rear of No.146, however, these are all of a modest single storey scale such that they do not encroach or erode the openness on entering and within Marston Close. In contrast, the proposed first floor extension would have a dominantly enclosing effect for the reasons set out above.

6. I note the scheme has been designed to match the materials and appearance of the host dwelling. I also find the proposed additional door on the front elevation would not be harmful in design terms. However, these factors do not outweigh my concerns regarding the harmful impact of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appellant submits that other corner plots have been developed in recent years but no specific examples have been brought to my attention. In any event I have considered the appeal proposal in relation to its specific site context and have found there would be particular and significant harm to this part of the Borough.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CP3 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 which seeks a high quality built environment. It would also conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to protect or enhance local character and create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place through their layout and design. It therefore follows that the proposal would also fail to accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

8. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, including the absence of any local objection, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer
Inspector.
Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 5 December 2017
by David Spencer BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 12th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3184776
158 Baron Road, Dagenham, Essex RM8 3RS
• 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, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
• The appeal is made by Mr David Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
• The application Ref 17/00952/PRIOR6, dated 6 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2017.
• The development proposed is a single storey rear extension (depth: 5.95 metres, height to eaves 2.95 metres and maximum height 3.3 metres).

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters
2. I have taken the description of development from the Council’s decision notice which I consider more accurately describes the prior approval sought. The dimensions in the decision notice are taken from Section 4 of the appellant’s notification form and correspond to dimensions written on the submitted plans. In applying this description I have noted that the appellant describes on the notification form that the proposed extension would provide for “granny annexe” type accommodation and I deal with this in my decision.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue
3. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) states that the enlargement, improvement or alteration to a dwellinghouse is permitted development. Paragraph A.1 set out the limitations of this permitted development right.

4. As is the case here, where a development exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) of the GPDO then paragraph A.4(5) of the GPDO states that the Council must notify each adjoining owner or occupier about the proposed development. Adjoining occupiers have been notified at the application stage and 3 separate statements of objection were received in relation to No.156 Baron Road. Although the objections are from relatives of the occupier that does not invalidate them. They state that they are made on behalf of the occupier and they have arisen as a direct consequence of the local planning authority’s (LPAs) notification rather than wider consultation.
5. Paragraph A.4(7) of the GPDO states that where any owner or occupier of the adjoining premises objects to the proposed development, the prior approval of the LPA is required as to the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises. Paragraph A.4(9) of the GPDO states that the LPA must take into account any representations made as a result of the notice and consider the amenity of all adjoining premises, not just adjoining premises which are the subject of representations.

6. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of neighbouring properties at Nos. 156 and 160 Baron Road with regard to outlook and daylight levels.

**Reasons**

7. No.158 Baron Road is a mid-terrace two storey property within a short block of four similar dwellings. The adjoining No.160 is the end terrace positioned to the south and the adjoining No.156 another mid-terrace dwelling to the north. The terrace is positioned relatively close to the highway such that the principal amenity areas and outlook of the dwellings are to the rear. The properties benefit from a reasonable depth to the rear gardens although the width of both the properties and their rear gardens in this terrace can reasonably be described as modest. There are no existing extensions to the rear elevations of the terrace such that the ground floor openings, principally one single window, and amenity areas immediately to rear of these properties have a reasonably open outlook and good light levels.

8. Whilst being at the margins of the GPDO limitations for larger rear extensions, the site context of the unaltered rear elevation of the terrace and relatively narrow width of the rear gardens means the bulk and massing of the proposed extension would appear as a prominent ground floor addition in this open backland area. It would be particularly dominant in the outlook at both Nos. 156 and 160, where the relative narrowness of the gardens is compensated by the open perspective of adjoining undeveloped gardens.

9. Whilst there is no objection from the occupiers of No.160 I find the length and height of the proposed side elevation to the boundary of this property would be a particularly oppressive feature. It would significantly reduce the existing sense of openness at the immediate rear of this property, including the ground floor window which is only moderately set in from the boundary. This would be particularly the case given the set-back position of the neighbouring maisonettes on Baron Road to the south. As such the rear ground floor elevation of No.160 would be detrimentally enclosed by the appeal proposal.

10. Again because of the relative narrowness of the plot widths and absence of any rear extensions, similar would apply to the occupiers of No.156 notwithstanding the retained side gap of approximately 1 metre. The depth and height of the proposed extension would be overbearing in the outlook from the rear of this dwelling. Consequently, I find the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the outlook at the rear of Nos. 156 and 160 Baron Road.

11. With regards to light levels I find the position of the proposal to the north of No.160 would not detrimentally affect daylight levels at this property. The extension would be to the south of No.156 I find the height of the building and its proximity would have an overshadowing effect at the rear of this property.
including those parts of the garden closest to the house. This adds to my concerns regarding the overbearing effect of the proposed extension.

12. The appellant submits that the proposed extension would have very little impact and visibility above any permitted boundary fence. I find the difference in height would be material, particularly given the proximity of the massing of the proposed development to neighbouring properties. The difference in height would be palpable and as I have found this difference, over the depth proposed, would be oppressive in the immediate rear outlook of both Nos.156 and 160.

13. The appellant also submits a potential fall-back position that the LPA generally supports single storey extensions of 3.65 metres or that a single storey extension of 3 metres could be built on the boundaries without prior approval. Such schemes would be materially different to the appeal proposal and I am not persuaded that they would have a more invasive impact on the outlook from No.156 given the appreciably shallower depth. In respect of the outlook from No.160 these suggested fall-back positions would be of little consequence given the appeal proposal is already positioned close to the boundary.

14. I therefore conclude that the proposed rear extension would unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring property at No. 156 Baron Road with regard to outlook and daylight levels and at No.160 Baron Road with regard to outlook. The proposal would be contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to avoid the immediate loss of outlook and more generally maintain residential amenity. It therefore follows that the proposal would also fail to accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

15. The appellant submits that the extension would provide accommodation to care for a senior family member. The submitted plans clearly show annexe accommodation but I have very few details of the care needs required or why the scale of development would be the minimum necessary. As such I can only attach limited weight to the benefit of providing care and it does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the amenities of existing and future occupiers of Nos. 156 and 160 who would permanently endure the oppressive outlook.

16. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer
Inspector.
## Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

**Application Reference** | **Decision** | **Applicant** | **Brief Description of Development and Location** | **Ward**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
17/00801/ FUL | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | Mr V Kens | Erection of two storey side extension. 2 Verney Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5LL | Parsloes
17/00923/ FUL | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | Mr M S Auhammud | Erection of single storey rear extension. 41 Victoria Road Barking Essex IG11 8PY | Abbey
17/01110/ ADV | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | Co Op Food | Installation of internally illuminated fascia sign, internally illuminated projecting sign, 9 non-illuminated wall mounted aluminium panels and 1 non-illuminated vinyl panel. Co Op 98 - 100 Dagenham Road Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0TJ | Eastbrook
17/01159/ FUL | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | Ms I Iusco | Erection of outbuilding in rear garden and replacement of existing timber boundary fencing with 1.2 and 1.8 metre high brick walls. 56 Thatches Grove Romford Essex RM6 5LH | Chadwell Heath
17/01163/ TPO | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | Elim Christian Centre | Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Pollarding of two Lime trees. 89 Axe Street Barking Essex IG11 7LZ | Abbey
17/01171/ TPO | Permitted on 6 September 2017 | London & Quadrant Housing Trust | Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Pollarding of 2 Lime trees. 8 Berengers Place Dagenham Essex RM9 4PT | Mayesbrook
### 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>17/01309/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and Permission refused on 6 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Skeels</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: 3.0 metres). 13 Glencoe Drive Dagenham Essex RM10 7NS</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01017/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 7 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Aslam</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension and loft conversion comprising rear dormer window and two front rooflights. 59 Sparsholt Road Barking Essex IG11 7YG</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01175/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 7 September 2017</td>
<td>London &amp; Quadrant Housing Trust</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: T1 (lime) - re-pollard. 9 Berengers Place Dagenham Essex RM9 4PT</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/02024/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs G Patel</td>
<td>Change of use of first floor flat (Use Class C3) to a house in multiple occupation (Class C4). 27A Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 7NX</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00183/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Diamond Pub Ltd</td>
<td>Erection of covered smoking area shelter. Thatched House Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 9PG</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7 September 2017

### 8 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>17/00886/ADV</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Turner &amp; Townsend C/o AS Watson</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated fascia and projecting box sign. 56 - 58 East Street Barking Essex</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00949/FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>LBBD - Jo Richardson Community School</td>
<td>Erection of canopy. Jo Richardson Community School Gale Street Dagenham Essex RM9 4UN</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00951/FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>ALDI Stores Ltd</td>
<td>Application for variation of condition following grant of planning permission 15/00619/FUL: Variation of condition 2 (drawing numbers) in respect of amendments to building design, appearance and parking bays. Aldi Unit 1 Merrielands Retail Park Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6SJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01028/CLU_P</td>
<td>CLU_P</td>
<td>Mrs T Akther</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 22 Glenmore Way Barking Essex IG11 0LY</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01178/CLU_P</td>
<td>CLU_P</td>
<td>Mr A O Lawal</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. 13 Thicket Grove Dagenham Essex RM9 4NR</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01179/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S K Buttar</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. 12 Rosslyn Road Barking Essex IG11 9XN</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01182/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M C Tillakaratne</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 37 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01183/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Rose Lane Trading Ltd T/A New Point Food &amp; Wine</td>
<td>Installation of automated teller machine (ATM). 113 Rose Lane Romford Essex RM6 5NR</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01184/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Rose Lane Trading Ltd T/A New Point Food &amp; Wine</td>
<td>Installation of internally illuminated ATM fascia and surround signage. 113 Rose Lane Romford Essex RM6 5NR</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01322/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 8 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hussain</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.9 metres; height to eaves: 2.75 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 72 Fanshawe Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8RQ</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>17/01103/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Simmons</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness of a proposed use: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflights. 578 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM10 7RU</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01106/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms M Valcheva</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of three front rooflights. 51 Coral Close Romford Essex RM6 5EH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01129/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr G A Hussain</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of three front rooflights. 15 Netherfield Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TL</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01148/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr V Pauliucenko</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 64 Gainsborough Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01186/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Butt</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension and loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window. 132 Lodge Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2JP</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01190/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss K Ojan</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 and erection of single storey rear extension. 16 Charlotte Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8TD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01191/CLU_P</td>
<td>Application Refused on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Y Sultan</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of side dormer windows and installation of front and rear rooflights. 20 Schooner Close Barking Essex IG11 0GG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01192/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Y Sultan</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side/rear extension and single storey rear extension. 20 Schooner Close Barking Essex IG11 0GG</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01194/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Amir</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. 214 Bennetts Castle Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 3XP</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01200/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss D Vincent</td>
<td>Erection of rear conservatory. 12 Bluebell Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XN</td>
<td>Eastbrook</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>17/01202/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 11 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M C Tillakaratne</td>
<td>Erection of front porch. 37 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 6TJ</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00320/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>LMP Dagenham Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 8 (SUDS), 14 (construction management plan) and 17 (foundation design) in respect of planning permission 16/01475/FUL. Eddie Stobart Logistics 1 Pooles Lane Dagenham Essex RM9 6RS</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00877/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hussain</td>
<td>Conversion of house into one 3 bedroom and one 2 bedroom houses and erection of front porch. 39 Hepworth Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9BA</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01030/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Capital City Investments Limited</td>
<td>Erection of two storey, two bedroom end of terrace house (retrospective) 62 Canonsleigh Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4DJ</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01060/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr H R Khan</td>
<td>Erection of first floor side extension and conversion of garage to a habitable room with a front window. 129 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LE</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>17/01203/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr E Tingco</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 38 Kent Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8HA</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01209/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Buzhala</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side, single storey front and rear extensions. 331 Sheppey Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4JU</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01216/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 12 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Smith</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension and two storey side extension. 47 Julia Gardens Barking Essex IG11 0UL</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00812/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Sutton</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and front rooflight, new windows and other alterations (retrospective). 135 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LF</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00772/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Corneli</td>
<td>Erection of front porch and part single/part two storey side and rear extension. 2 Hatch Grove Romford Essex RM6 5JR</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01052/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Chipantiza</td>
<td>Conversion of garage to habitable room and erection of single storey rear extension. 45 Wanderer Drive Barking Essex IG11 0XJ</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01055/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Silk House Hotel Ltd</td>
<td>Change of use from Use Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) to Use Class C1 (Hotel) including alterations to the internal layout to provide 19 guest rooms. Upper Floors, 2 Station Parade Barking Essex IG11 8DL</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01121/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Rahman</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of front porch, rear extension and remodelling of house. 163 Padnall Road Romford Essex RM6 5EP</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01218/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms L Bacon</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 42 Baron Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1UB</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01220/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>LMP Dagenham Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 13 (Unforeseen contamination) in respect of planning permission 16/01475/FUL. Kuehne And Nagel Limited 1 Pooles Lane Dagenham Essex RM9 6RS</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01223/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Z Iqbal</td>
<td>Retention of outbuilding in rear garden. 37 Netherfield Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TL</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01332/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Sajjad</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 2.48 metres existing and 3.52 metres proposed; height to eaves: 2.75 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 1078 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1BP</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>17/01358/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 13 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Havers</td>
<td>Installation of handrails and ramp to front elevation. 5 Lambourne Road Barking Essex IG11 9PP</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00700/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mrs M Kirlew</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 16 (construction environmental management plan) in respect of planning permission 16/01305/REG3. Burford Close Garages Burford Close Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00878/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Ms I Gourov</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey, two bedroom detached house. 50 Sandown Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8XD</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00892/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mrs M Kirlew</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 11 (investigation and risk assessment), 12 (remediation scheme) and 13 (remediation scheme implementation) in respect of planning permission 16/01305/REG3. Burford Close Garages Burford Close Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01057/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Kaur</td>
<td>Conversion of single storey side extension to form two bedroom self-contained flat. 1070 Green Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1BT</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>17/01231/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Zogu</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights. 26 Walfrey Gardens Dagenham Essex RM9 6JB</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01310/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Installation of 78 internal and 34 external CCTV cameras. Coventry University London Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01335/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs C Mears</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: 3.175 metres). 14 Listowel Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7QP</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01355/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs E Kangetsmabo</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 5.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.45 metres and maximum height: 3.8 metres). 147 Padnall Road Romford Essex RM6 5EP</td>
<td>Chadwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01372/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Y Shinwari</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.95 metres and maximum height: 3.3 metres). 15 Park Drive Dagenham Essex RM10 7AA</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>17/01374/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 14 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Gardner</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.766 metres and maximum height: 3.088 metres). 83 Stanley Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 1JL</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 15 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>17/01024/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Osemwekha</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension and loft conversion comprising rear dormer window and front rooflights. 9 Norfolk Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8EX</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01046/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Sadiq</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 13 Goodey Road Barking Essex IG11 9PB</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01234/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Hughes</td>
<td>Conversion of existing house into two self-contained flats 264 Rugby Road Dagenham Essex RM9 4AS</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01241/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Ahmed</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 69 Upney Lane Barking Essex IG11 9LD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01246/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Choudhury</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. 265 Salisbury Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9XX</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01249/TPO</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr W Weaver</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Crown reduction of 25% to protected horse chestnut tree. 73 Campion Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0WX</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01303/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs I Deane</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window. 114 Beccles Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HZ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01317/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Tran</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 25 Donne Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2JG</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01342/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>M Akram</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 3 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HS</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01345/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs J Roy</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.723 metres and maximum height: 2.723 metres). 487 Heathway Dagenham Essex RM9 5UX</td>
<td>Alibon</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>17/01411/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Khan</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves: 3.0 metres and maximum height 4.0 metres). 98 Baron Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1UA</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01354/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required and permission refused on 15 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Faruque</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>
<tr>
<td>16/00387/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 18 September 2017</td>
<td>Lovell Partnership Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 6 (hard landscape) and 8 (boundary treatment) in respect of planning permission 14/00293/FUL. Lymington Fields Turnage Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00876/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 18 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs S Slavovska</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension (retrospective). 115 Valence Wood Road Dagenham Essex RM8 3AP</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01213/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 18 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hannan</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. 131 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18 September 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>17/01214/FUL</td>
<td>Application Perm</td>
<td>Mr M Hannan</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 131 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itted on 18 Septe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mber 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01251/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refu</td>
<td>Mr G Kandola</td>
<td>Retrospective application for conversion of a three bedroom dwelling to 2 self-contained one bedroom/one person flats. 59 Morley Road Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sed on 18 Septemb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>er 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01253/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issu</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Jones</td>
<td>Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness: Erection of outbuilding within rear garden 19 Ashbrook Road Dagenham Essex RM10 7ED</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sed on 18 Septem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ber 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01257/FUL</td>
<td>Application Perm</td>
<td>LBBD – Mrs J Hardy</td>
<td>Installation of access ramp with handrails to front of house. 55 Langdale Close Dagenham Essex RM8 1XY</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itted on 18 Septe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mber 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01292/PRIOR4</td>
<td>Prior approval re</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company Ltd</td>
<td>Application for prior notification of proposed demolition of ground water storage tank. Engine Plant Ford Motor Company Estate Thames Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 6SA</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quired on 18 Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ember 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01142/FUL</td>
<td>Application Perm</td>
<td>Mr A Ojolowo</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension in connection with conversion of house into 1 one bedroom flat and 1 studio flat. 14 Ridgewell Close Dagenham Essex RM10 9AJ</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itted on 19 Septem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ber 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>17/01261/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 19 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Khan</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of single storey rear extension. 98 Baron Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1UA</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01264/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 19 September 2017</td>
<td>LMP Dagenham Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (external materials) and 4 (hard landscaping) in respect of planning permission 16/01475/FUL. Eddie Stobart Goresbrook Park 1 Pooles Lane Dagenham RM9 6RS</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01360/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 19 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Sufaj</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). 45 Bevan Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9NW</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00799/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 20 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss S Begum</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. 42 Stratton Drive Barking Essex IG11 9HJ</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01117/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 20 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss M S Siegert</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Use of part of house as mini-cab control room. 4 Dunbar Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 7JT</td>
<td>Heath</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>17/01160/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 20 September 2017</td>
<td>Wellgate Community Farm</td>
<td>Demolition of existing toilet block and the erection of a single storey building to provide male, female and accessible WCs. Wellgate Farm Collier Row Road Romford Essex RM5 2BH</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01273/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 20 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr N Ali</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft extension involving construction of rear dormer windows to main roof and roof of two storey rear projection. 37 Monteagle Avenue Barking Essex IG11 8RB</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 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>17/01090/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs I Dashko</td>
<td>Erection of rear outbuilding. 56 Lindisfarne Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2QX</td>
<td>Becontree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01144/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 21 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Gaxha</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of front porch. 19 Dagenham Avenue Dagenham Essex RM9 6LD</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01181/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 September 2017</td>
<td>Weston Homes Plc</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 34 (car parking management plan) in respect of planning permission 15/01526/FUL. Abbey Park Industrial Estate 52 Abbey Road Barking Essex</td>
<td>Gascoigne</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>17/01276/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr H Chana</td>
<td>Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 83 Saville Road Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6DS</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01361/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 21 September 2017</td>
<td>Friends Life Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 8 (Internal layout of residential units) in respect of planning permission 14/00966/OUT. Merrielands Development Site Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/01812/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Resco Investments</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (contamination), 8 (sustainable urban drainage system), 13 (soft landscaping) and 31 (archaeology) in respect of planning permission 16/01482/FUL. 4 - 6 Ripple Road Barking Essex IG11 7PE</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01212/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Goldfinch</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension. 30 Kings Avenue Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6BB</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01210/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Gray</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Erection of outbuilding in rear garden. 36 Oakley Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9JD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Applications Decided/Refused under Delegated Powers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Reference</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Brief Description of Development and Location</th>
<th>Ward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/01263/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Desecki</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. 8 Melbourne Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6TA</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01274/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss J Obeya</td>
<td>Erection of two storey side extension 160 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2AF</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01287/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Miss C Redwood</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 25 Wilmington Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9TP</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01290/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Caliste</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. 271 Westrow Drive Barking Essex IG11 9BU</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01394/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Olofin</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.5 metres; height to eaves: 2.68 metres and maximum height: 3.45 metres). 47 Beamway Dagenham Essex RM10 8XR</td>
<td>Village</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>17/01395/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ferizolli</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). 87 Auriel Avenue Dagenham Essex RM10 8BU</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01396/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr A Ahmadi</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.0 metres; height to eaves and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 260 Porters Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 2EQ</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01404/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required on 22 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr K Ahmed</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). 77 Sandringham Road Barking Essex IG11 9AF</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00683/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Ahmed</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. 141 Cavendish Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9DY</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01007/FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr G Iuga</td>
<td>Installation of brick cladding over existing facing brick on front elevation. 3 Ben Tillet Close Barking Essex IG11 9NT</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>17/01132/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Khan</td>
<td>Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window and erection of front porch extension and single storey rear toilet extension. 34 Oakley Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9JD</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01155/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr M Hogue</td>
<td>Erection of part single/part two storey side extension. 140 Arden Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 4SA</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01288/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issue on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr P Bajorinas</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. 21 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JH</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01311/ LBC</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Application for Listed Building Consent: Installation of 78 internal and 34 external CCTV cameras Coventry University London Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01406/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Singh Sabha London East</td>
<td>Application for partial approval of details reserved by condition 8 (BREEAM) in respect of planning permission 13/00688/FUL. Singh Sabha Temple 98 - 100 North Street Barking Essex IG11 8JD</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>17/01409/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 September 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>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01413/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr D Vaitekvnas</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). 9 Thorntons Farm Avenue Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0TT</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01415/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mrs Y Maqbool</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 2.9 metres). 259 Ivyhouse Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5RT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01440/ PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval not required on 25 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr Shahid</td>
<td>Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 4.65 metres; height to eaves: 2.9 metres and maximum height: 3.0 metres). 91 Victoria Road Barking Essex IG11 8PZ</td>
<td>Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00462/ OUT</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 26 September 2017</td>
<td>Mercedes-Benz Retail Group UK Limited</td>
<td>Application for outline planning permission: Redevelopment of site to provide car/van dealership, with workshop, MOT testing, servicing and other car-related activities (e.g. minor repairs, wet and dry valet, vehicle preparation) involving demolition of existing former refrigerated</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>17/00953/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr S Alderson-Claey</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension. 3 Meadow Road Barking Essex IG11 9QT</td>
<td>Eastbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01122/ FUL</td>
<td>FUL</td>
<td>Mr S Rahman</td>
<td>Erection of two storey 2 bedroom house. 163 Padnall Road Romford Essex RM6 5EP</td>
<td>Chadwell Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01152/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 26 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr T Dubikaitis</td>
<td>Application for a certificate of lawfulness for a proposed development: Loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window and three front roof lights and erection of an outbuilding in rear garden. 24 Leonard Avenue Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XL</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01256/ CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 26 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Akpore</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 and erection of a porch 39 Dorothy Gardens Dagenham Essex RM8 2HR</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>17/01066/ FUL</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr S Butt</td>
<td>Erection of first floor and roof extension. Unit 3 Dominion Works Freshwater Road Dagenham Essex RM8 1RX</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01135/ CDN</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 September 2017</td>
<td>Friends Life Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 5 (design code) in respect of planning permission 14/00966/OUT. Merrielands Development Site Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01313/ TPO</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 September 2017</td>
<td>LBBD - Mr C Richardson</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Crown reduce Ash (T4) to previous points (40%). Grantham Court Grantham Gardens Chadwell Heath Essex</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01316/ TPO</td>
<td>Permitted on 27 September 2017</td>
<td>Southern Housing Group</td>
<td>Application for tree works subject to a tree preservation order: Fell tree (T1). 42 Carnation Close Rush Green Romford Essex RM7 0XQ</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01529/ LDO</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 27 September 2017</td>
<td>Capital Hair &amp; Beauty</td>
<td>Pre-development Notification (Employment Areas Local Development Order) - Change of use of Unit 2 from place of worship (Use Class D1) to storage and distribution (Use Class B8); installation of new window and door openings, canopies over external doors, and external cladding to Units 1 and 2; replacement of roof panels and installation of photovoltaic panels to roof, and reconfiguration of mezzanine floor of Unit 2. Units 1 And 2 Cromwell Centre Selinas Lane Dagenham Essex RM8 1QH</td>
<td>Whalebone</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>28 September 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00686/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mulalley And Co.</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (highways scheme) and 8 (external lighting) in respect of planning permission 15/01779/FUL. Ilchester Road Garages Ilchester Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01245/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Miss A Jiang</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension. 32 Fanshawe Crescent Dagenham Essex RM9 5ES</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 September 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00657/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr L Gyurov</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side/rear extension and erection of front porch 8 Harris Road Dagenham Essex RM9 5DT</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00687/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mulalley And Co.</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 3 (highways scheme) and 8 (external lighting) in respect of planning permission 15/01780/FUL. Fitzstephen Road Garages Fitzstephen Road Dagenham Essex</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>17/00840/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Dribuild</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 (facing materials) in respect of planning permission 16/01889/FUL. Western Car Park East London Leisure Park Cook Road Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Goresbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00958/FUL</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Mr S Baig</td>
<td>Conversion of house into 2 one bedroom, 1 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom flats. 101 Whalebone Lane South Dagenham Essex RM8 1AJ</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01268/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Total Swimming</td>
<td>Erection of 50 x 8m swimming pool with associated changing facilities, store and CHP (Combined Heat Power) plant room comprising the erection of a 17 metre high chimney. Becontree Heath Leisure Centre Althorne Way Dagenham Essex RM10 7FH</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01279/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr P Mazreku</td>
<td>Erection of first floor rear extension. 95 Church Elm Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 9RJ</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01289/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr P Bajorinas</td>
<td>Erection of single storey front extension and porch. 21 Hunters Hall Road Dagenham Essex RM10 8JH</td>
<td>Alibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01489/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mr P Desecki</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension 8 Melbourne Gardens Chadwell Heath Romford Essex RM6 6TA</td>
<td>Whalebone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Reference</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Brief Description of Development and Location</td>
<td>Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01328/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Erection of a gable end roof above existing two storey side extension. 32 Clare Gardens Barking Essex IG11 9JH</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01330/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr F Osaze-Omoruyi</td>
<td>Erection of single storey rear extension (retrospective). 5 Martin Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2XH</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01336/ FUL</td>
<td>Application Refused on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Mr R Kucinskas</td>
<td>Construction of hard surface for car parking in front garden. 30 Cornworthy Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2DE</td>
<td>Mayesbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01368/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Friends Life Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 7 (Site levels) in respect of planning permission 14/00966/OUT. Merrielands Development Site Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01370/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Friends Life Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 17 (tree protection) and 18 (root protection) in respect of planning permission 14/00966/OUT. Merrielands Development Site Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01393/ CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 29 September 2017</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 15 (car parking management plan) in respect of planning permission 16/01390/FUL. Coventry University London Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>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>17/01423/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Friends Life Ltd</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 36 (residential and workplace travel plans) in respect of planning permission 14/00966/OUT. Merrielands Development Site Merrielands Crescent Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Thames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01445/PRIOR6</td>
<td>Prior approval required</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J &amp; H Hussain</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: 2.8 metres). 103 Melford Avenue Barking Essex IG11 9HR</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01463/CDN</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Coventry University London</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 13 (Travel Plan) in respect of planning permission 16/01390/FUL. Coventry University London Civic Centre Wood Lane Dagenham Essex RM10 7BN</td>
<td>Heath</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2 October 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>17/01146/FUL</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Mr S Lepenko</td>
<td>Erection of two storey 2 bedroom dwelling. 320 Valence Avenue Dagenham Essex RM8 3QX</td>
<td>Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01236/FUL</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Mrs R Begum</td>
<td>Conversion of garage into habitable room and installation of window on the front elevation and erection of ground floor rear infill extension and first floor side and rear extensions. 180 Fitzstephen Road Dagenham Essex RM8 2YJ</td>
<td>Becontree</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>17/01331/CDN</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 October 2017</td>
<td>LBBD</td>
<td>Application for approval of details reserved by condition 36 (Code for Sustainable Homes - design stage certificates) 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>17/01338/FUL</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 October 2017</td>
<td>Mr M A Hannan</td>
<td>Retention of outbuilding in rear garden. 10 Cornwall Close Barking Essex IG11 9JF</td>
<td>Longbridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01339/CLU_P</td>
<td>Certificate issued on 2 October 2017</td>
<td>Mr Z Ali Syed</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. 29 Sutton Road Barking Essex IG11 7YD</td>
<td>Gascoigne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/01380/NMA</td>
<td>Application Refused on 2 October 2017</td>
<td>Semilarhus Development Ltd</td>
<td>Application for non-material amendment following grant of planning permission 15/00362/FUL (removal of allocated front garden to ground floor units and reconfiguration of internal layout in order to access units from the communal corridors served by the main entrance/reception area). New Enterprise House High Road Chadwell Heath Essex</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>17/01587/ADV</td>
<td>Application Permitted on 2 October 2017</td>
<td>Be First</td>
<td>Installation of advertisement hoarding. London East Business And Technical Park Yewtree Avenue Dagenham Essex</td>
<td>Eastbrook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>