

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
3 December 2015 (7.30 - 8.40 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace (Vice-Chair),
Ray Best, Steven Kelly and +Jason Frost

Residents' Group Reg Whitney and +Barry Mugglestone

**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 Philippa Crowder and Stephanie Nunn.

+Substitute members: Councillor Jason Frost (for Philippa Crowder) and Councillor Barry Mugglestone (for Stephanie Nunn).

Councillors Julie Wilkes, Joshua Chapman and John Mylod were also present for parts of the meeting.

20 members of the public 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.

364 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

365 **P1295.15 - GIDEA PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, LODGE AVENUE**

Councillor Wallace declared a dis-closable non-pecuniary interest in that his grandchildren attended the school referred to in the application.

The application before Members was for the construction of a demountable classroom. The building measured 155m² in Gross Internal Area and contained a classroom, offices and amenities. The proposed classroom was to accommodate a planned bulge expansion of up to 30 pupils from either Reception Year or Year 1 children. The proposed building would have a flat roof matching the height and design of the other buildings on the site.

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

The objector commented that neighbour notification letters had been sent to 105 neighbouring occupiers and that the Council had received 97 objections to the proposals. The objector commented that whilst not unsympathetic to the proposal it appeared to be a rushed decision that failed to take into account the existing constraints that the school had to operate within particularly with regard to health and safety and pupil wellbeing.

In response the applicant's representative commented that forecasts had shown that there was a future need for extra school places borough-wide which needed to be addressed. The extra building would be required for a bulge class that would pass through the school for the next five years when planning permission would expire and the demountable classroom would be removed from the site.

With its agreement Councillor Joshua Chapman addressed the Committee.

Councillor Chapman commented that the Council had a statutory obligation to provide education within the borough and extra school places were needed. Councillor Chapman also commented that 97 letters or representation had been received which highlighted local resident's concerns regarding the expansion of the school which would affect the local amenity and place a strain on road safety in the area. Councillor Chapman concluded by commenting that the proposal would not be suitable in the long term but as a temporary measure for a five year period it would be acceptable if robust plans were introduced to deal with road safety.

During a brief debate Members discussed the proposed expansion of schools across the borough with Members raising a concern that none of the proposals for school expansions sought to enlarge the school kitchens or catering provision to cope with extra pupils.

Members also discussed the school's ability to cope with an additional classroom and generally Members felt that this particular site could manage quite well with what was quite a modest expansion. Members agreed that

there was an increasing need for extra school places throughout the borough.

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

The vote for the resolution was carried by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention. Councillor Wallace voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillor Martin abstained from voting.

366 **P1316.15 - 24 MUNGO PARK ROAD, RAINHAM**

The application before Members was for retrospective planning permission for a single storey rear extension with a depth of 2.87m (in line with the existing rear extension, a width of 6.25m and a height of 3.35m. This would create a single storey rear extension spanning the width of the building. Planning permission was required for the extension owing to its width, which was beyond that for which permitted development rights applied.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Julie Wilkes on the grounds of:

- a lack of car parking spaces
- insufficient space for additional cars in the cul-de-sac
- loss of privacy and light

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

The objector commented that the proposal was of a bad design that casted a shadow over a neighbouring property and would also put an extra strain on the drainage of surrounding properties. The objector also commented that the application property was a house in multiple occupation (HMO) and that there had been incidents of noise nuisance and anti-social behaviour. The objector concluded by commenting that the proposal would also impact on parking provision in a small cul-de-sac.

The applicant's representative responded by commenting that the proposed extension was situated away from the objector's property and that there had been no breaches of planning control.

With its agreement Councillor Julie Wilkes addressed the Committee.

Councillor Wilkes commented that as the proposal was retrospective there had already been a loss of privacy on the neighbouring property. Councillor Wilkes also commented that the developer had not complied with building regulations and that the proposal was an overdevelopment of a garden

area, out of character with the streetscene and would lead to a loss of light on a neighbouring property.

During the debate Members received clarification on the permitted development rights of the application site and what parts of the development were original and what had been previously extended.

Members also considered the impact of the re-development on the parking provision in the cul-de-sac and whether there was scope for introducing additional parking provision to the front of the property.

Although some Members agreed that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site it was felt that the application would probably win on appeal if the applicant decided to take the decision to refuse the application to the Planning Inspectorate.

The report recommended that planning permission be approved, however following a motion to defer the consideration of the proposal it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred to allow staff to negotiate with the applicant to demonstrate how a minimum of two parking spaces both with proper access could be accommodated on the site, including what impact this had on existing on-street parking spaces.

367 **P1015.15 - UNITS 1-2 & 10, MUDLANDS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MANOR WAY, RAINHAM**

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 had been previously advised that the facility would be dealing with the processing and disposing of pre-shredded tyres.

The application had been heard at the last Committee meeting on the 12 November 2015. Members had resolved to defer the decision to allow additional information to be presented. In this regard Members had requested further detailed information on the potential risk of fire; the submission of a fire risk management plan; clarification on any potential air quality and odour; and confirmation that the proposal would not be incompatible with the longer term objectives of the City in the East masterplan.

During a brief debate Members discussed the previous concerns and felt that they had been addressed by the submission of the Fire Safety and Emergency Plan.

Following a question regarding the training requirement of staff working at the premises, at the Chairman's discretion, the applicant was invited to address Member's concerns in person.

It was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and to impose an additional condition requiring training to be operated in accordance with the Fire Plan and subject to satisfaction that the issue would also be covered by the granting of an Environmental Permit.

368 **P1377.15 - 110 SUNNINGS LANE, UPMINSTER- TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS**

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

369 **P0911.15 - BEEHIVE COURT, GUBBINS LANE, HAROLD WOOD - INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO CONVERT 14 BEDSITS AND 3 FLATS INTO 10 ONE-BEDROOM FLATS AND 1 TWO-BEDROOM FLAT. ALTERATIONS INCLUDE INFILLING, PARTIALLY EXTERNAL LOBBY ENTRANCE AREA AND REPLACEMENT DOOR**

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

370 **P1368.15 - 1 ALBYNS CLOSE, RAINHAM - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 19 DWELLING HOUSES WITH ASSOCIATED AMENITY, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. AMENDED BUILDING POSITIONS OF PLOT 1-4, 7-9 & 12-14. INCLUSIVE FROM PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER P1034.14**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to:

- The provision on site of a minimum of 50% of the units as affordable housing in accordance with the requirements of Policy DC6 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.

- The Council's legal fees for preparation of the agreement should be paid on or prior to completion and the Council's planning obligation monitoring fees should be paid as required by 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.

371 **P0821.15 - CROWNFIELD JUNIOR SCHOOL, WHITE HART LANE, ROMFORD - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO ENLARGE EXISTING ADMINISTRATION OFFICE AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL TEACHING SPACE ASSOCIATED INTERNAL ALTERATIONS**

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

372 **P0954.15 - TRAINING GROUND & SPORTS STADIUM, RUSH GREEN ROAD, ROMFORD- ALTERATIONS AND EXTENSIONS TO THE EXISTING BUILDINGS ON THE SITE INCLUDING REMODELLING OF THE CLUB BUILDING AND EXTENSION OF CANOPY OVER STANDS; ERECTION OF NEW OFFICES, GROUNDSMAN'S BUILDING, GATEKEEPER LODGE AND IRRIGATION TANK; EXTENSION TO HARDSTANDING**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposal qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £2,369, and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

373 **P1429.15 - ONGAR WAY, RAINHAM - DEMOLITION OF GARAGES AND RE-DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE TO PROVIDE NINE DWELLINGS (REVISED SCHEME TO PREVIOUS PERMISSION P1644.11)**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £13,500 and **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £54,000 (such contribution having already been paid to the Local Authority under the previous scheme) to be used towards educational infrastructure costs
- 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.

374 **P1566.12 - RAINHAM LANDFILL - PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE CONTINUATION OF WASTE INPUTS AND OPERATION OF OTHER WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITIES (MATERIALS RECYCLING FACILITY, WASTE TRANSFER STATION, OPEN AIR COMPOSTING SITE, GAS ENGINES, LEACHATE TREATMENT PLANT, AND INCINERATOR BOTTOM ASH PROCESSING) UNTIL 2024 AND RE-PROFILING OF FINAL CONTOURS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions and S106 legal agreement heads of terms set out in the report to Committee dated 18 December 2014 and added to at that meeting.

375 **PLANNING OBLIGATIONS/LEGAL AGREEMENTS**

The Committee considered a report that updated Members on the position of legal agreements and planning obligations. This related to approval of various types of application for planning permission decided by the Committee that could be subject to prior completion or a planning obligation. This was obtained pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Acts.

The report also updated the position on legal agreements and planning obligations agreed by this Committee during the period 2000-2015.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and the information contained therein.

376 **PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS RECEIVED, PUBLIC INQUIRIES/HEARINGS AND SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISIONS**

The report accompanied a schedule of appeals and a schedule of appeal decisions, received between 1 August 2015 and 12 November 2015.

The report detailed that 43 new appeals had been received since the last meeting of the Monitoring Committee in September 2015.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and the results of the appeal decisions received.

377 SCHEDULE OF ENFORCEMENT NOTICES

The Committee considered and noted the schedules detailing information regarding enforcement notices updated since the meeting held in September 2015.

Schedule A showed notices currently with the Secretary of State for the Environment (the Planning Inspectorate being the executive agency) awaiting appeal determination.

Schedule B showed current notices outstanding, awaiting service, compliance, etc. with up-dated information from staff on particular notices.

The Committee **NOTED** the information in the report.

378 PROSECUTIONS UPDATE

The report updated the Committee on the progress and/or outcome of recent prosecutions undertaken on behalf of the Planning Service.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

379 SCHEDULE OF COMPLAINTS

Members had previously been emailed a schedule which listed the complaints received by the Planning Control Service regarding alleged planning contraventions for the period 15 August 2015 to 13 November 2015.

The Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** the actions of the Service.

Chairman

