

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
4 August 2016 (7.30 - 9.55 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace, Ray Best, Steven Kelly and Michael White

Residents' Group Stephanie Nunn and +Julie Wilkes

East Havering Residents' Group Alex Donald (Vice-Chair) and Linda Hawthorn

UKIP Group Phil Martin

Independent Residents Group Graham Williamson

An apology was received for the absence of Councillor Reg Whitney.

+Substitute members: Councillor Julie Wilkes (for Reg Whitney).

Councillors Viddy Persaud, Linda Van den Hende, Ron Ower, Darren Wise, Keith Darvill and Denis O' Flynn were also present for parts of the meeting.

60 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.

47 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 30 June and 14 July 2016 were agreed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

48 P0759.16 - THREE HORSESHOE FARM, NOAK HILL ROAD, ROMFORD

This report before Members considered an application for the erection of five new dwellings on land within the Green Belt and the Havering Ridge

Special Character Area. The proposal concerned the demolition of existing stabling, storage and residential buildings. A similar application was dismissed on appeal in March 2014 following an appeal against non-determination of that application.

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

The objector commented that the new proposal had not addressed the previous concerns and was an inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The objector concluded by commenting that the dwellings proposed were quite sizeable and out of keeping with the area.

The applicant's agent responded by commenting that the applicant had worked hard to remove the existing unsightly buildings and the proposed dwellings had far less impact on the site. The agent concluded by commenting that the proposed dwellings were designed to have rural feel and provided five quality much needed homes with large gardens and discrete parking.

With its agreement Councillors Keith Darvill, Denis O' Flynn and Ron Ower addressed the Committee.

Councillor Darvill commented that the new application did not address the previous concerns. The proposed dwellings offered no difference in height and would lead to a loss of rural ambience. Councillor Darvill also commented that StreetCare had expressed concerns regarding highways issues and that no special circumstances had been submitted to allow the proposal to be built on Green Belt land.

Councillor O' Flynn commented that if the proposal was allowed then it could set a precedent to development within the Green Belt. Councillor O' Flynn also commented that the area was subject to flooding and had been the site of numerous vehicular accidents.

Councillor Ower commented that he had originally supported the previous refusal. Councillor Ower also commented that the site was on the edge of a conservation area and that the proposal was out of keeping with the surrounding area.

During a brief debate Members discussed whether there were any special circumstances to allow the proposal to be built on Green Belt land and the impact the proposal would have on the openness of the site.

The report recommended that planning permission be approved however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that:

- The proposal by reason of its location (Havering Ridge impact), form, alien appearance, height and physical impact would materially harm

rural openness and such harm would not be outweighed by very special circumstances.

- Failure to secure aspects covered by proposed Section 106 legal agreement.

The resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Best abstained from voting.

49 **P0565.16 - 7 CAMBORNE WAY, ROMFORD**

The application before Members was for the erection of a ground and first floor rear extension.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with a response by the applicant's agent.

The objector commented that the proposal would lead to overshadowing and a loss of sunlight to the neighbouring property. The objector also commented that the proposal would be intrusive, overbearing and create additional need for parking in the area.

In response the applicant's agent commented that the scheme had been revised and conformed to planning approval.

With its agreement Councillor Darren Wise addressed the Committee.

Councillor Wise commented that the proposal would lead to a loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties and was out of keeping with the streetscene and asked that the Committee reject the application.

During a brief debate Members discussed the proposed extension and the possible effect it could have on neighbouring properties.

Members also discussed the possibility of the property becoming a HMO.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

That the extension by reason of its size and impact would constitute overdevelopment of the site through its oppressive impact on the setting of the adjoining terraced house's garden causing overshadowing and reduction in rear garden enjoyment materially harmful to neighbours' amenity.

50 **P1652.15 - 2 BROOKLANDS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the erection of an apartment building to provide ten 2-bedroom flats and associated vehicular access, drainage works and landscaping, following the demolition of all existing buildings.

The application was originally presented to the Committee on 31 March 2016 with a recommendation for approval. It was deferred in order to clarify the enforcement history on the site, whether vehicle access safety arrangements could be improved and whether a contribution could be made for affordable housing. A full response to the request for clarity was covered in the report.

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

The objector commented that the proposal would harm neighbouring residents' amenity and that the parking spaces planned for the development along the boundary wall backed on to neighbouring properties. The objector also commented that there was a lack of emergency access and parking in the area.

The applicant's agent responded by commenting that the proposal was a high quality design and that the fenestration arrangements for the development meant that there would be no overlooking of neighbouring properties. The agent also commented that the number of vehicle movements on and off the site would be halved following the completion of the development.

With its agreement Councillor Viddy Persaud addressed the Committee.

Councillor Persaud commented that the current building was an eyesore but the planned development's height was too high compared to the surrounding properties. Councillor Persaud also commented that there was a general lack of parking in the area and that the proposal would also be out of keeping in the streetscene.

During a brief debate Members discussed the proposed height of the development and the lack of parking in the area.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that:

- By reason of height, bulk, design, scale and position the proposal created an intrusive and overbearing development out of character with locality and harmful to amenity of neighbouring properties' outlook, privacy and rear garden enjoyment.
- Failure to secure matters via proposed Section 106 agreement.

51 **A0028.16 - CROW METALS, JUTSUMS LANE, ROMFORD -
ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR SIX FIXED RIGID PVC SIGNS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that advertisement consent be part approved and part refused subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

52 **P0722.16 - CROW METALS, JUTSUMS LANE, ROMFORD**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the provision of a platform office on-site.

Members noted that the application had been called-in Councillor Persaud on the basis that the site and use caused numerous problems to nearby residents including, but not limited to, parking issues in Crow Lane and Jutsums Lane; and general amenity impacts.

With its agreement Councillor Viddy Persaud addressed the Committee.

Councillor Persaud commented that lorries delivering to the site were often backed up on to the surrounding road which caused problems for motorists and pedestrians. Councillor Persaud also commented that the proposal would create more office space which in turn would mean more staff parking in the surrounding roads which were unable to cope with the existing parking need.

Following a motion to defer consideration of the report it was **RESOLVED** that Consideration of the report be deferred to seek clarification of whether the proposal further reduced the space available within the operational yard and as a result affected swept paths (agreed within the original approval for the use) such that lorries have to back into the roadway and/or are caused to sit on adjacent highway in a manner harmful to traffic safety and neighbours' amenity especially during early morning.

53 **P0279.16 - BROOK FARM, ST MARY'S LANE, NORTH OCKENDON**

The application before Members was for a single storey rear extension and conservatory to the side.

Members noted that the application had been call-in by Councillor Linda Van den Hende on the grounds that the application property was situated on a large plot and it was not considered that the proposed extension significantly affected the openness of the Green Belt.

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

Councillor Van den Hende commented that the application was modest in size and sort to replace an existing conservatory and provide a new utility room. Councillor Van den Hende also commented that the site was of a huge nature and that the proposal would have no impact on neighbours and that no objections had been received.

During a brief debate Members questioned the scale of the proposal and its impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

A motion was put forward to grant planning permission, this was however lost by 4 votes to 6 with 1 abstention.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as per the reason set out in the report.

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

Councillors Best, Kelly, White, Nunn, Wilkes and Martin voted for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

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

Councillor Williamson abstained from voting.

54 **P0763.16 - 37 GAYNES COURT, UPMINSTER**

The report before Members sought planning permission for a porch, conversion of a garage with new pitched roof and single storey side and rear extensions.

Members noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Van den Hende on the grounds that she considered the proposal to be an over development of the site and to have a significant impact on the neighbouring property 35 Gaynes Court by affecting the light to internal rooms at the neighbour's address and the extent of the rear extension would impact on the neighbour's outside space.

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

Councillor Van den Hende commented that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the neighbouring property and its amenity.

During a brief debate Members discussed the effect the proposal would have on the neighbouring property and sought and received clarification of the closeness of the two properties.

A motion to refuse the granting of planning was put forward but was lost by 3 votes to 8.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

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

Councillors Misir, Best, Kelly, Wallace, White, Nunn, Wilkes and Martin voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

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

55 **P1687.15 - 2 INGREBOURNE GARDENS, UPMINSTER - ERECTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as per the reasons set out in the report.

56 **P1648.15 - LOGAN MEWS (LAND OFF), ROMFORD - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES AND THE ERECTION OF A TERRACE ROW OF FOUR ONE-BEDROOM DWELLINGS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as per the reasons given in the report.

57 **P0983.16 - LANGTONS JUNIOR & INFANT SCHOOL, WESTLAND AVENUE, HORNCHURCH - ERECTION OF TWO TEMPORARY SINGLE STOREY DEMOUNTABLE BUILDINGS FOR USE AS A CLASSROOM AND ADMINISTRATION CENTRE AND MINOR ASSOCIATED EXTERNAL WORKS**

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

58 **P1201.15 - SHEFFIELD DRIVE (LAND REAR OF), HAROLD HILL - CONSTRUCTION OF 4 NEW DWELLINGS (2 X 3 BEDROOM SEMI-DETACHED) WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND PRIVATE AMENITY SPACE, NEW ACCESS ROAD AND LANDSCAPING.**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £8,240 and without debate

RESOLVED that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £24,000 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 pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement, prior to completion of the agreement, irrespective of whether the legal agreement was completed.
- The Developer/Owner to pay the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee prior to 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.

59 **P0800.16 - BROADFORD PRIMARY SCHOOL, FARINGDON AVENUE - PROPOSED ERECTION OF A 6M HIGH ROPE CLIMBING PYRAMID WITH A SAFETY PLAY SURFACE BELOW, ON AN AREA OF THE EXISTING PLAYING FIELD.**

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

Chairman