

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
12 November 2015 (7.30 - 10.15 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS:** 11

**Conservative Group** Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace (Vice-Chair),  
Steven Kelly, +John Crowder and +Michael White

**Residents' Group** Stephanie Nunn and Reg Whitney

**East Havering  
Residents' Group** Alex Donald and Linda Hawthorn

**UKIP Group** Phil Martin

**Independent Residents  
Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Ray Best and Philippa Crowder.

+Substitute members: Councillor John Crowder (for Ray Best) and Michael White (for Philippa Crowder).

Councillors Linda Van den Hende and Ron Ower were also present for parts of the meeting.

25 members of the public and a representative of the Press were present.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

**352 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 October were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

*It was also **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2015 approved and signed by the Chairman at the meeting on 22 October 2015 be amended in the following respect to correct an*

*inaccuracy subsequently discovered concerning minute number 337 - P1116.15 Units 4A and 4B Market Place, Romford.*

*The following condition was to be included in the Section 106 agreement a restriction on residents applying for parking zone permits (apart from blue badge holders).*

**353 P1173.15 - 90 MAIN ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the demolition of an existing garage in the rear garden environment of 90 Main Road, Romford and the erection of a detached chalet bungalow with living space within the roof.

The application had been called-in by Councillor Joshua Chapman who wished the Committee to discuss the provision of parking and considered the application merited greater discussion of the planning specifics which made up the proposal.

Members were advised that due to other commitments Councillor Chapman was unable to attend the meeting but had submitted a written statement to be read before the Committee. Councillor Chapman's statement commented that there was a lack of parking provision at the site and that the site was inappropriate for such a development. Councillor Chapman also commented that the site was included within Development Control Policy DC69 covering the Gidea Park Special Character Area.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant.

The objector commented that there were concerns from local residents that the proposed development would lead to a need for increased parking provision. The objector also commented that there already existed a problem with parking overspill from the nearby park and primary school. The objector concluded by commenting that the proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the area.

The applicant responded by commenting that the proposed development was of benefit to the area as there was a shortfall of bungalows in the area. The applicant also commented that the development would have a minimal impact on the area.

During a brief debate Members discussed the style of existing properties in the area and the possible impact of parking provision on the surrounding roads.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to approve the granting of planning permission which was carried by 8 votes to 3 it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the head of

Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the applicant entering and completing a legal agreement to secure an education contribution and subject to conditions to include the following and any others judged necessary by the head of Regulatory Services:

- Permitted development restriction
- Materials
- Windows
- Boundary treatment
- Full accordance with plans
- Parking
- Landscaping

Also in the event that the applicant did not agree to enter into a legal agreement then the application would be referred back to the Committee for consideration.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 3.

Councillors Misir, Crowder, Kelly, White, Donald, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Wallace, Hawthorn and Nunn voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

354 **P1115.15 - THE SANCTUARY (LAND ADJACENT), PEA LANE**

The application before Members proposed to utilise the application site as a car park, to be used in conjunction with The Sanctuary health centre. The site would have thirteen car parking spaces. The site would utilise the existing access off Pea Lane, and would be surfaced in permeable gravel.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Linda Van den Hende on the grounds that the new application covered all the issues previously set out as reasons for rejection, primarily as it's in the Green Belt. The car park was temporary, would be made of materials which could be easily removed and the land which was currently in the corner of a farmer's field and unused for crops, could be returned to agricultural use. The planting of trees along the boundary of the area would shield the car park and indeed enhance an area which was currently unsightly and after the car park was returned to agriculture would be a lasting enhancement. It would improve the business of The Sanctuary and enable the existing car park close to the treatment rooms to be allocated exclusively for disabled parking.

With its agreement Councillor Linda Van den Hende addressed the Committee.

Councillor Van den Hende re-emphasised the points made in her call-in commented that the business had been in place since 1998 and had proved beneficial to the community. Councillor Van den Hende also commented that the proposal would be a safe secure area and that there would be no loss of amenity and asked that the Committee approved the granting of planning permission.

During the debate Members discussed the possible harm to the Green Belt and the proposal's special circumstances.

Some Members felt that by granting planning permission on Green Belt land weakened the Council's position when it came to refusing other applications that were on Green Belt land.

There was also mention of the alleviation of parking problems that the proposal would help with but again some Members felt that by granting planning permission a dangerous precedent could be set and that developing on Green belt land was not the answer to solving a shortage of parking throughout the borough.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to approve the granting of planning permission which was carried by 6 votes to 4 with 1 abstention it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to a condition requiring that the car park use was to cease and the land be fully reinstated to Green Belt use and appearance in accordance with details to be submitted and agreed in writing and subject to any other conditions which the Head of Regulatory Services judged necessary.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 6 votes to 4 with 1 abstention.

Councillors Misir, Crowder, White, Donald, Hawthorn, Whitney voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Kelly, Wallace, Nunn and Martin voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillor Williamson abstained from voting.

355 **P1669.14 - 68 STATION ROAD, UPMINSTER**

This application before Members was for the conversion and extension of existing premises in Upminster Town Centre to create six additional one-bed flats, whilst reconfiguring the layout of two existing two-bedroom flats. The extension would be to the rear of the building with no material changes to the front elevations. The existing ground floor retail unit would be retained, but with less floorspace.

With its agreement Councillor Ron Ower addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ower commented that the development would be in a noisy town centre location which was located next to a 24 hour operational bakery and the proposed properties would suffer from a lack of amenity. Councillor Ower also commented that the access to the development was via a private road that served other retail units in the parade. Councillor Ower concluded by commenting that there would also be a lack of parking and noise nuisance from the nearby station especially if twenty four hour tube operation was extended to the District Line.

During a brief debate Members received clarification of the proposed developments proximity to the station and discussed the issue of buyer beware that would be a judgement call for any prospective resident.

A motion to refuse the granting of planning permission was lost by 2 votes to 9.

Members noted that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £4,760 and **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a planning obligation under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £36,000 to be used for educational purposes in accordance with the policies DC29 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 9 votes to 2.

Councillors Misir, Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, White, Nunn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Donald and Hawthorn voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

356 **P0321.15/P0323.15 - ST GEORGE'S HOSPITAL, SUTTONS LANE, HORNCHURCH**

The report before Members considered two outline planning applications that had been received for the redevelopment of St. George's Hospital, Suttons Lane, Hornchurch. The site had been vacant since 2012 and was now surplus to requirements. Both applications were submitted with all matters reserved except for access although the proposals set development parameters and a scale threshold for development. An illustrative masterplan for the overall development of the site had also been submitted.

P0321.15 was for the partial demolition and redevelopment of 10 hectares of the St George's Hospital site to provide up to 290 dwellings including the retention and conversion of some of the existing buildings, new build residential housing and apartments, together with the creation and retention of areas of open space, a linear park and swale gardens and play space areas.

P0323.15 was for the redevelopment of 1.74 hectares of the St. Georges Hospital site located to the north west of the site for the purposes of providing up to 3,000 sq metres of new healthcare development together with a new vehicular access, plus car parking, infrastructure and landscaping.

Officers advised that there were a number of amendments to the report.

Item 3.2.4 on page 137 should now read as:

- Not more than 290 residential units;
- The retention, refurbishment and conversion of 6 key buildings along the frontage of the site (119/121 Suttons Lane, the Willows building, Gatehouse, Admin and Ingrebourne buildings and the northern ward block) to provide 75 apartments and houses.
- New build development of 215 dwellings.
- A predominant height of two to three storeys with no more than 3 locations identified for 4 storey development.
- Developed parcels not to exceed 6.54 ha.
- New housing laid out on a predominantly perimeter block arrangement except where adjacent to or backing onto the healthcare site or properties in Hacton Drive.
- An indicative masterplan mix of housing which would deliver:

- 14% 1 bed apartments
- 28% 2 bed apartments
- 2% 3 bed apartments
- 12% 2 bed houses
- 24% 3 bed houses
- 14% 4 bed houses
- 4% 5 bed houses
- 1.4% studio flats
- 15% of units offered as affordable housing.
- Car parking at a rate of 1.7 per unit overall.

Item 7.4.6 should also now read as:

*The scheme proposed the retention and re-use of 4 of the six most important buildings on the site, plus two others, all of which offer the opportunity for viable residential conversion.*

Condition 5 of the report on page 133 to be amended to read Footprint and Floorspace.

On page 143 Natural England had now withdrawn its objection.

Members agreed to delegate any changes to the conditions of the planning permission to the Head of Regulatory Services

During the debate Members received clarification on the distribution of S106 monies and Mayoral CIL contributions.

Members also received clarification that the existing chimneys on the site were to be removed during the development.

Members also discussed the parking provision for the healthcare centre which was felt to be insufficient in relation to the amount of people who would be working at and visiting the site.

With regards to the residential development Members felt that 15% affordable housing was not sufficient and that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site which left very little “green” areas and was a loss of the Green Belt.

Members also questioned the decision to build studio flats as these appeared to be out of keeping with modern home building practices.

With regards to P0323.15, the healthcare facility, the report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to defer the consideration of the item it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the item be deferred to provide an opportunity for the applicants to (significantly) increase parking on site for occupiers and users.

With regards to P0321.15, residential development, the report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 8 votes to 3 it was **RESOLVED** to refuse the granting of planning permission on the grounds of:

- Inappropriate, harmful development of the Green Belt;
- Overdevelopment of the site by reason of unit numbers, built form and impact on openness;
- Failure to meet minimum internal space standards;
- Failure to secure by legal agreement the following – education contribution;
- Sustainable transport/cycling improvements;
- Mitigation of the Country Park impact;
- Affordable housing provision

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 3.

Councillors Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, White, Nunn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Misir, Donald and Hawthorn voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

357 **P0760.15 - 268-272 NORTH STREET, ROMFORD - ADDITIONAL STOREY AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING FIRST FLOOR OFFICE TO CREATE A TOTAL OF EIGHT FLATS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** to refuse the granting the granting of planning permission contrary to officer recommendation on the grounds of:

- Poor quality residential environment for future occupiers of the development.
- Failure to meet minimum internal space standards.
- Insufficient amenity space.
- Failure to secure education contribution via a legal agreement.

358 **P1015.15 - UNITS 1,2 AND 10 MUDLANDS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE**

The application before Members sought temporary planning permission to utilise units 1, 2 and 10 as a waste material recovery facility (sui generis use class). The proposal, in addition to the aforementioned proposed change of use, included:



- The erection of two external ventilation ducts/flues to unit 1
- The erection of external high-level ductwork/pipework between units 1 and 10
- The installation of an electricity substation and associated pipework and connections to the National Grid substation to the immediate west of the site.

Members were advised that facility would be dealing with the processing and disposing of pre-shredded tyres.

During the debate Members questioned the amount of vehicle movements to and from the site and how the fumes from the burning process would be efficiently removed from the site so as not to impact on the amenity of local residents.

Members also noted that there had been no comment from the London Fire Brigade as to how they would deal with a fire on the site.

In reply to a question regarding why DEFRA had not submitted a response, officers replied that as the tonnage level of tyres being processed was below 50,000 then the Council would licence the activity.

It was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the item be deferred for further information to clarify:

- a) Fire risk management plan to address the risk of combustion of shredded tyres material.
- b) Risk of fire (including arising from arson) of stored tyres (a) and (b) to be checked specifically with the Fire Brigade.
- c) Air quality and smell disturbance including perceptions that may "billow smoke" thereby prejudicing amenity and regeneration of area.

359 **P1207.15 - 112-116 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD - CHANGE OF USE OF PART GROUND FLOOR AND FOUR UPPER FLOORS (USE CLASS A3) TO HOTEL (C1) INCLUDING EXTENSION TO SIDE ELEVATION**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

- 360 **P1340.15 - PLOTS 7 & 8 BEAM REACH BUSINESS PARK, CONSUL AVENUE, RAINHAM - CONTINUATION OF DEVELOPMENT OF TWO TALL INDUSTRIAL UNITS, THE INSTALLATION OF PRINTING PRESSES AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT & BUILDINGS INCLUDING OFFICES, TOILETS AND PLANT ROOMS WITHOUT COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION 10 (REQUIRED ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY STANDARDS) ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION REFERENCE: U0006.06**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that the application was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to a variation to the existing Deed made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to:

- Remove the existing Section 3 (Use of Renewable Energy and Reduction in Carbon Emissions) of Schedule 1 – Covenants in Respect of Plot 7; and
- Secure a financial contribution of £66,000 towards the London Borough of Havering's Carbon Reduction Fund, prior to any further occupation of Plot 7.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to make the aforementioned variation to the existing Deed and, upon completion of that obligation, re-issue planning permission as per the conditions as set out in the report.

- 361 **P1366.15 - PORTMAN HOUSE 16-20 VICTORIA ROAD, ROMFORD - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT SECOND FLOOR LEVEL TO THE REAR PART OF THE BUILDING AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AT FOURTH LEVEL TO THE FRONT PART OF THE BUILDING TO PROVIDE FIVE RESIDENTIAL UNITS (FOUR X 1 BEDROOM UNITS AND ONE X 2 BEDROOM UNIT)**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** to refuse the granting of planning permission contrary to officer recommendation on the grounds of:

- Overdevelopment resulting in excessive mass/height harmful to streetscene including the relationship with neighbouring buildings;
- Inadequate on-site parking provision;
- Failure to secure £30,000 (note not £36,000 as in report paragraph 6.22 as it was 5 additional flats not 6) education contribution via legal agreement.

The vote for the resolution to refuse planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 1.

Councillor Misir voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

362 **P0191.15 - 253 CHASE CROSS ROAD, ROMFORD - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BLOCK COMPRISING OF SIX FLATS.**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £5,244 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £30,000 to be used for educational purposes.
- All contribution sums should include interest to the due date of expenditure and all contribution sums to be subject to indexation from the date of completion of the Section 106 agreement to the date of receipt by the Council.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement was completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the completion of the agreement.

That the Head of Regulatory Services be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

363 **SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS**

During the discussion of the reports the Committee **RESOLVED** to suspend Committee Procedure Rule 8 in order to complete the consideration of the remaining business of the agenda.

---

**Chairman**