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
a Planning Inspector.

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 

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.