MINUTES OF
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL BOARD

Monday, 12 December 2016
(7:00 - 9:00 pm)

Present: Cllr Sanchia Alasia (Chair), Cllr Faraaz Shaukat (Deputy Chair), Cllr Peter Chand, Cllr Edna Fergus, Cllr Irma Freeborn, Cllr Cameron Geddes, Cllr Syed Ghani, Cllr Rocky Gill, Cllr Kashif Haroon, Cllr Giasuddin Miah, Cllr Margaret Mullane, Cllr Chris Rice, Cllr Liam Smith, Cllr Bill Turner and Cllr Jeff Wade

Apologies: Cllr Abdul Aziz and Cllr Faruk Choudhury

45. Declaration of Members’ Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

46. Minutes (7 November 2016)

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2016 were confirmed as correct, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 41- Land south of Cemetery, Whalebone Lane North, Romford-16/01025/FUL

Third paragraph to add: “The S106 contribution for affordable housing was not confined to the ward.”

47. Development Control Board Visiting Panel site visit- Farmhouse Venue, Dagenham Road, Dagenham-16/00755/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to the Farmhouse Venue and removal of conditions following a grant of planning permission and removal of conditions 9 and 11 of 14/01256/FUL to allow temporary buildings and structures e.g. marquees to be erected on site and to remove the limit on the number of attendees.

The Farmhouse Venue (formerly Farmhouse Tavern) had planning permission for use as an events venue subject to conditions restricting the number of guests attending seated events, and the erection of marquees or other structures within the curtilage of the building.

The purpose of conditions 9 and 11 of the existing permission was to limit traffic generation in view of the access arrangements and limited onsite parking capacity, and to prevent harm to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt.

The applicant sought the deletion of these conditions in order to enable the operation of the venue without any restriction on the number of attendees and to enable the use of marquees.
The capacity of the building alone was approximately 180 for seated events, and therefore the installation of a marquee within the curtilage of the site was required in order to provide sufficient seating capacity for larger events which the applicant wishes to accommodate.

The Council’s Constitution stated that one of the functions of the Development Control Board was to appoint at the commencement of each municipal year a Visiting Group to undertake inspections of buildings and sites as directed by the Board and to make recommendations to the Board. It was felt necessary to undertake a site visit in this specific case.

It was agreed that the Visiting Group of the Development Control Board would undertake a site visit in respect of the application and to report back to the January 2017 Development Control Board meeting.

48. Kings House, 96 North Street, Barking- 16/01409/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Kings House, 96 North Street, Barking and the installation of new window openings in connection with the use of the ground floor as a higher education facility with ancillary offices.

London Churchill College provided educational courses for higher national diplomas and certificates, foundation degrees and Bachelor of Arts (BA) (Honours) degrees in the disciplines of business management, events and hospitality management and health and social care.

The proposed college would generally accommodate 10 staff in total (academic and administrative) on a regular basis on a typical weekday and up to 80 students per day on site. The applicant had agreed to the imposition of a condition on any planning permission which restricts the number of students on site to a maximum of 80 per day (condition 5 refers).

As there has been no take up of the commercial unit for health care facilities over a significant timeframe, officers supported the principle of a higher educational facility as it maintains the original proposal for a community use on the site and would improve local access to higher education.

The proposed new windows would not be openable and the glazing would not project above the height of the existing boundary fences so as to protect the privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.

The application proposed the retention of five on-site car parking spaces, including one blue badge space, for staff and visitors. It was envisaged that most students would arrive by public transport given the town centre location and the high public transport accessibility of the site. The proposed cycle parking provision is in accordance with London Plan policy.

A 62 signature petition letter has been received from residents of William Street Quarter objecting to the application. Officers, however, considered that the proposed use and the proposed new windows would not result in any significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the
proposal is in keeping with the relevant policies.

The Chair invited Asim Uddin, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He was very concerned about parking issues in William Street and stated that there was a great deal of illegal parking in the vicinity which would worsen considerably if this application were agreed. He added that a number of PCN (penalty notices) were issued in the area and it was often very difficult for local businesses finding places to park.

The Chair invited Muhammad Khan, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He noted that the application stated there would be no more than eighty students and ten staff on site, however he considered that this would exacerbate severe parking problems in the William Street vicinity. He was also concerned about the potential for noise, nuisance and anti-social behaviour. He considered that the application, if approved, would have an adverse and negative effect on the quality of life for residents.

The Chair invited Leota Dennis, an objector to the application, to address the Board. She was a resident of William Street and was very concerned about parking and traffic problems with the potential for anti-social behaviour by students if the application were approved. Although she considered that the College had good intentions, she felt that the vicinity of William Street was an inappropriate location for the College and stated that Barking Town Centre would have been a more appropriate venue for an educational establishment.

The Chair invited Edmund Wright, Director of A4 Architects, on behalf of the applicant to address the Board. He stated that the premises were originally intended to become a health facility and that its new use as an educational facility was beneficial to the local community. These courses on health and social care would generally be for thirty-fourty year olds. He re-iterated that the facility would be for no more than eighty students and ten teachers as part of the application conditions and would cause less disruption than the previously planned health centre, intending to be open from 9.00 am-6.00 pm on weekdays. He said that Churchill College were a very professional educational provider who had worked with the University of Bedford in organising life skills. Mr Wright noted the objector’s concerns on parking issues however stated that most students would be arriving at the venue by bike or on foot and in any case, there was a small covered area for disabled parking within an adjacent cycle store. He considered that the venue would generate less noise and disruption than if the premises were a health centre.

The Chair invited Mr Chowdhury, the applicant and Director of Churchill College, to address the Board. He noted objector’s complaints about noise, nuisance and parking however re-iterated Mr Wright’s comment that most students would attend the proposed college by public transport however expressed his desire to work with and support the local community to minimise any problems. The courses offered would relate to vocational training on health and social care and would benefit the community.

In answer to a question, the applicant stated that the facility would be used by students aged over the age of eighteen.

The Board were concerned about the potential for continuing parking problems
in William Street, particularly as there is the potential for new housing developments in the vicinity. The Development Management Manager responded that the Council’s parking strategy sought to discourage smaller car parks and to encourage the use of public transport where possible and that students would be able to park in the Multi-storey car park in London Road. If users of the proposed college parked illegally, then this was a matter for enforcement officers in issuing penalty notices. He added that the area in William Street and in the Barking Town Centre were very well served by public transport and asked the Board to consider the application for an educational facility on its merits.

The Board granted planning permission subject to the conditions listed in this report (with any amendments that might be necessary up to the issue of the decision notices).

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:

   15/31/01, 15/31/02 Rev C, 15/31/03 and 15/31/04 Rev B.

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

3. The 5 car parking spaces indicated on drawing No. 15/31/02 Rev C, including one blue badge space which is to be clearly marked with a British Standard disabled symbol, shall be marked out prior to occupation of the development and thereafter retained permanently for the accommodation of vehicles of staff and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

   Reason: To ensure and promote easier access for disabled persons and 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 and policy 6.13 of the London Plan.

4. The 18 cycle parking spaces shown on drawing No. 15/31/02 Rev C shall be provided prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained permanently for the accommodation of bicycles of students, staff and visitors to the premises and not used for any other purpose.

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

5. The development hereby permitted shall be restricted to a maximum of 80 students per day on site.
Reason: In the interests of protecting the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6. The combined rating level of the noise from any plant installed pursuant to this permission shall not exceed the existing background noise level when evaluated one metre from the window of any adjacent residential premises. Any assessment of compliance with this condition shall be made according to the methodology and procedures presented in BS4142:2014.

Reason: To ensure that noise-sensitive rooms within any adjacent residential premises are adequately protected from noise and in accordance with policy BR13 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

7. Air conditioning and other plant room machinery and equipment shall be designed to ensure that structure borne (re-radiated) noise emissions from the ventilation system shall not exceed 35 LAeq dB (5 min) when measured in any habitable room in adjoining residential premises.

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

8. The proposed windows hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building and no new glazing shall project above the height of the relevant adjoining boundary fence.

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

9. The premises shall be used for health care facilities or as a higher educational facility and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).

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

49. 5 Hewett Road, Dagenham- 16/01252/FUL

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 5 Hewett Road, Dagenham. The application site was located on the eastern side of Hewett Road, Dagenham. It was a 3 storey building located in a shopping parade which formed part of the Martins Corner Neighbourhood Centre. The ground floor previously was a retail unit, the first and second floors are in use as residential accommodation. The application sought permission for a proposed change of use from a shop (Class A1) to a tuition centre with
community welfare activities (Class D1).

It was understood that the application site has been in use as a place of worship, tuition centre, and community centre for the past seven years and operating without planning permission. This application proposed to cease the use of the premises as a place of worship and to gain lawful consent for a tuition centre and community welfare activities only. The use of the centre as a place of worship ceased on 30 September 2016, officers have kept a watching brief and were satisfied that Friday prayer activities no longer take place on the site.

A review of the retail frontage of the Martins Corner Neighbourhood Centre had been undertaken. This revealed that if the proposed D1 use for 5 Hewett Road was agreed, the proportion of non-A1 use for the frontage would not exceed the 35 per cent limit set by policy BE1 and as such the change of use would not be contrary to Council policy.

The application site has no off-street parking provision; however, Hewett Road has unrestricted off-street parking. The Transport Development Management Team had raised no objection to the proposal on the condition that the premises were no longer used as a place of worship.

It was considered that the range of social, education and welfare services offered by the centre provide a valuable community asset utilising a commercial unit in a fringe part of the Neighbourhood Centre where an A1 use is no longer considered likely to be viable.

The Chair invited Peter Harris, an objector to the application, to address the Board. He considered that the premises had been operating illegally as a worship venue for seven years up to September 2016 and had been the subject of enforcement action. Mr Harris felt that the applicant had showed little respect for the Council or its conditions of use. He felt that if the application was approved, worship would still take place at the premises. The applicant’s agent had stated that he was willing to move the worship elsewhere. He considered that the applicant had been inconsiderate and the premises had led to severe parking problems for residents and businesses. In answer to a question, Mr Harris stated he was the voicing concerns of residents and small businesses as a former Chair of the local Chamber of Commerce. He also refuted the view that the premises were not viable for business use. He asked the Board to reject the application and support business use for the premises instead.

The Chair invited Asim Khan, the applicant, to address the Board. He advised that the centre had been operational since 2008. Since that time, community events, courses and activities for students had taken place at the premises. This included GCSE’s and other courses relating to e.g. business, internet safety and cessation of smoking. There were also courses on health and fitness, counselling and conflict resolution. The premises promoted social gatherings and cohesion and he referred to Ifthar, where the community were invited to break fast during Ramadan. The centre also had an annual gathering at Sydney Russell School. They had over 100 students on site and employed fifteen staff including two women. He considered that the centre encouraged footfall and highlighted that the Centre was community-funded not for profit
organisation and did not charge for courses and was of benefit to the community.

Members were concerned that the Centre had been operating for seven years without planning permission and asked the applicant whether the Centre would be for sole community use only. They also asked if those attending courses were local. Mr Khan responded that the Centre was never established as a place of worship and was set up as a community facility offering a wide range of facilities and courses for students. He did state that in the past certain members of the centre had used the premises for worship on Fridays, however the use of worship was stopped. He noted that as far as this activity was concerned, a different management committee had been put in place and the previous Management Committee were removed following an enforcement notice. He added that every effort was being made to correct the previous issue of illegal worship and this should be viewed as being a positive step forward. In addition, most users of the centre lived locally and several shops were vacant nearby, in fact the centre were asking for a change of category from a shop to community centre. He gave the Board an undertaking that the centre would not be used for worship as contained in the conditions attached to this application.

In answer to a question, the Development Management Manager stated that he had visited the premises and that there was no evidence that approval of the application would lead to anti-social behaviour. Moreover on highways grounds, the application could not be reasonably refused.

Members were keen to ensure that the Enforcement Team and Planning Officers maintained a watching brief on the issue of worship not taking place in future, in line with the condition (no.2) in the application.

Members noted that the application site currently had a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2 on a scale of 1-6 (where 6 is excellent). However, they also noted in the report that Martins Corner Neighbourhood Centre was well served by several bus routes and suitably sited for access by foot or bicycle.

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

1) The premises shall not be open except between 0900 and 2000 Monday to Saturday and between 1000 and 2000 Sundays.

   Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

2) The premises shall not be used as a place of worship.

   Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring residents in accordance with policy BP8 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document.

*(After this item, the Board held an adjournment from 7.50-7.56 pm)*
50. **69 Aldborough Road, Dagenham - 16/01498/FUL**

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to 69 Aldborough Road, Dagenham relating to the installation of dormer windows to the front and rear elevations and alterations to the appearance of the front elevation involving the installation of new windows and removal of front bays and canopy.

The proposed changes to the front elevation included the removal of two existing front bay windows at ground floor level and three first floor windows to be replaced with five Georgian style windows serving each floor. The existing side entrance door would remain unchanged and other properties in the vicinity would not be overlooked.

In addition, a planning application for the erection of a two storey rear extension to the property was approved in 2014 under planning reference 14/00550/FUL and was currently under construction and these works did not form part of this application.

Members asked whether officers from Planning Enforcement had intervened in this case and whether planning rules had been specifically flouted. In response, the applicant’s agent, Muhammed Shah stated that no enforcement had been carried out at the property and he confirmed that officers had visited the property twice following the 2014 planning application. He added that there were no issues of overlooking other properties and that if planning officers had any concerns they would raise these with him or the applicant.

Members asked whether in future reports could include any relevant enforcement history. The Acting Head of Planning and Regeneration (Regeneration) said in future reports to the Board would include this information.

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: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08.

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

51. **Burford Close Garages, Burford Close, Dagenham-16/01305/REG3**

The Development Management Manager introduced a report on the application relating to Burford Close Garages, Burford Close, Dagenham. This involved the erection of six new dwellings with external amenity spaces less than the
requirements of Policy BP5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD.

The application site was located at the end of Burford Close, a short cul-de-sac accessed from Bennetts Castle Lane, Dagenham. The land was the previous site of 30 garages which had now been demolished following several years of disuse. The site was bordered by the rear garden walls of neighbouring properties in Farmway, Linkway, Bennetts Castle Lane and Berrymans Close.

The application related to the erection of 6 bungalows, 4 of which were one bedroom 2 person and 2 two bedroom 3 person units, together with car parking and landscaping. Each of the units would comprise of a separate living area, kitchen, utility store, bedroom(s) and a wet room. Whilst all of the units were wheelchair standard, two had been designated as fully accessible units. The units were intended for elderly residents who do not necessarily need warden assistance or sheltered accommodation but may have frailty or mobility issues. The bungalows will be owned and managed by the Council.

The proposed development complied with the London Plan space standards. The Council Access Officer has been involved with the proposed plans from an early stage and has confirmed that the proposals met the necessary accessibility criteria.

He added that officers were recommending a slight wording change to conditions 7 and 8 to allow the submission of details of the boundary treatment and refuse stores later in the development process to help ensure early delivery of the bungalows.

In answer to a question raised at the meeting, the Development Management Manager confirmed that the residents of the bungalows would not be eligible for the Right to Buy (RTB) as they would be taking extended tenancies and this would be made clear to them at the outset.

The Board granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:

3) 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).

4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A0095.01, A0095.02, A0095.03, A0095.04, A0095.05, A0095.06, A0095.07, A0095.08, A0095.09.

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

5) 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.

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

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

7) The landscaping scheme as approved in accordance with condition No 4 shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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

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

Reason: To safeguard and improve the appearance of the area and to provide safe movement throughout the site in accordance with policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan

9) No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the position, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The submitted details shall include details of the front security gates. No property shall 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.
10) No development above ground level shall take place until details of refuse enclosures showing the design, location and external appearance have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The approved enclosures shall be provided before the occupation of any of the residential units and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To provide satisfactory refuse storage 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.

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

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.

12) The car parking areas indicated on drawing number A0095.03 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.

11) An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:
   a. a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
   b. an assessment of the potential risks to:
      i. human health,
      ii. property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
      iii. adjoining land,
      iv. groundwaters and surface waters,
      v. ecological systems,
      vi. archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
c. an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

d. This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

12) A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

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

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

14) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of condition 10 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of condition 11 which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason (for conditions 11 to 14): Contamination must be identified prior to commencement of development to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors in accordance with policy BR5 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and policy 5.21 of the London Plan.

15) Demolition and construction work and associated activities are to be carried out in accordance with the recommendations contained within British Standard 5228:2009, “Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites”. Parts 1 and 2. Reason: To ensure that the proposed construction work does not cause undue nuisance and disturbance to neighbouring properties at
16) 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:

- construction traffic management;
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding(s) including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- wheel washing facilities;
- 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.
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- the use of efficient construction materials;
- 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 affected persons who have any problems or questions related to the ongoing development.

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

17) The units hereby permitted must be occupied by at least one tenant who is over statutory retirement age at the time of letting, in the case of Joint Tenancies at least one tenant must meet this criteria; or must be occupied by at least one tenant who has been assessed as requiring a wheelchair housing design standard dwelling and who is registered disabled regardless of age.

Reason: To accord with the submitted scheme and ensure that affordable accessible housing is provided in accordance with Policies BC1 and BC2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).

52. Town Planning Appeals
The Board noted details of the following appeals:

### Appeals Lodged

The following appeals have been lodged

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

Application refused under delegated powers 13 October 2016 (Mayesbrook Ward).

**b)** Loft conversion involving construction of gable end roof and rear dormer window – 42 Beccles Drive, Barking (Ref: 16/00760/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 19 July 2016 (Longbridge Ward).

**c)** Erection of annexe in rear garden to provide independent living accommodation for disabled daughter – 25 Charlotte Road, Dagenham (Ref: 16/00550/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 21 June 2016 (Village Ward).

**d)** Erection of single storey front and two storey side extension – 51 Melford Avenue, Barking (Ref: 16/00711/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 7 July 2016 (Longbridge Ward).

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

Application refused under delegated powers 27 September 2016 (Eastbrook Ward).

**f)** Erection of first floor extension to provide studio flat - 5 Porters Avenue, Dagenham (Ref: 15/01706/FUL)

Application refused under delegated powers 4 April 2016 (Parsloes Ward)

### 2. Appeals Determined

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

**a)** Enforcement appeal – Change of use of single dwellinghouse to house in multiple occupation – 12 St. Erkenwald Road, Barking (Abbey Ward)

b) Enforcement appeal – Change of use from industrial unit to place of worship – 442 Becontree Avenue, Dagenham (Valence Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 31 October 2016.

c) Enforcement appeal - Change of use of single dwellinghouse to house in multiple occupation – 136 Glenny Road, Barking (Abbey Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 8 November 2016.

d) Erection of part single/part two storey rear extensions and loft conversions involving construction of rear dormer windows in connection with change of use of 43 and 47 to care home for young people – 43 and 47 Waverley Gardens, Barking (Ref: 15/01449/FUL – Thames Ward)

Application refused under delegated powers 15 December 2015 for the following reasons:

1. The siting and design of the rear extension at No.43 would result in a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at No.41 Waverley Gardens by way of loss of light and outlook contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations.

2. The proposed development would result in the loss of two 3 bedroom family houses 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).

3. The proposed development, by virtue of the intensification of the existing residential use and especially in light of the terraced setting, would lead to a material increase in levels of noise and disturbance to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy BP8 of the Borough wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011).


e) Enforcement appeal -- Change of use of single dwellinghouse to two residential units - 76 Osborne Square, Dagenham (Alibon Ward)

Planning Inspectorate’s Decision: Appeal dismissed 18 November 2016.
53. **Delegated Decisions**

The Board noted details of delegated decisions for the period 5 September- 14 October 2016.