

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
8 December 2016 (7.30 - 10.30 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS:** 11

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

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

**East Havering  
Residents' Group** Linda Hawthorn and +Ron Ower

**UKIP Group** Phil Martin

**Independent Residents  
Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Ray Best and Alex Donald

+Substitute members: Councillor John Crowder (for Ray Best) and Councillor Ron Ower (for Alex Donald).

Councillors Jason Frost, Wendy Brice-Thompson and Frederick Thompson were also present for parts of the meeting.

35 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.

130 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2016 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

131 **P0562.15 - 102-124 SACKVILLE CRESCENT & 126-148 & 150-160 SACKVILLE CRESCENT**

The proposals before Members were for two separate planning applications that were considered together but voted on separately.

Proposal P0562.15 was for the construction of third floor extensions to the existing apartment blocks at 102-112 and 114-124 Sackville Crescent and would feature a mansard roof to create four new flats (two in each block).

Proposal P0567.15 was for the construction of third floor extensions to the existing apartment blocks at 126-148 and 150-160 Sackville Crescent and would feature a mansard roof to create six new flats (two in block 150-160 and four in block 126-148)

Members noted that an email had been submitted by Councillor Alex Donald in which he outlined his objections to the proposals.

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

The objector commented that the proposals would affect residential amenity and create parking problems in an area that already had displaced parking. The objector also commented that the proposals would lead to overlooking, privacy loss and overshadowing of neighbouring properties. The objector concluded by commenting that the proposals were also out of character in the area and could lead to access/egress difficulties for emergency vehicles during the construction phase.

The applicant responded by commenting that there was a critical need for housing within the borough and that the proposal included an upgrade to the entrance system, extra cladding and had been re-designed several times to take into consideration officer's comments. The applicant also commented that the gardens would remain intact and that the current buildings were not of a similar nature to the neighbouring properties.

During a brief debate Members discussed the lack of parking provision in the area, overdevelopment of the site and lack of amenity space that would be afforded to residents.

Both proposals were recommended for approval however following motions to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that both proposals be refused planning permission for the following reasons:

- By reason of inadequate car parking and loss of amenity space on site the proposals represented overdevelopment harmful to the amenity of residents.
- By reason of the four storey height the scale of the proposals would be harmfully out of character with the surrounding area.

- Inadequate parking on site was likely to lead to increased pressure for on street car parking which was already congested due to commuter etc parking in the locality.
- The failure to secure legal agreements for school places contributions.

**132 P0872.16 - ST CEDD HALL, SIMS CLOSE, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was seeking planning permission for the erection of single storey extensions, dropped kerb, disabled ramp and also for the retention of a raised decking area to the rear of the property with internal remodelling. The proposal would also include an extension link between the main building and outbuilding to create a reception area for the nursery.

Members noted that the proposal had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds that he considered it would result in an intensification of use in a domestic situation where housing was close by and the site was not far from retirement flats whose residents may not have enjoyed children playing outside. Councillor Thompson also had concerns that cars entering and leaving the site would be a source of noise and fumes to the immediately adjacent dwelling.

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 would be a loss of privacy to the adjoining properties in Sims Close and also expressed concern about the daily use of the hall and the increased traffic that would be using the cul-de-sac.

In response the applicant commented that the planned use was not a change of use class and that any noise emanating from the premises would be controlled. The applicant also commented that the site benefitted from good transport links and parking provision nearby.

With its agreement Councillor Frederick Thompson addressed the Committee.

Councillor Thompson commented that building works had already started and that the proposal would not be in keeping with the existing and neighbouring properties. Councillor Thompson also commented that the proposal would create more traffic dangers to children in the area as the pavements were quite narrow.

During a brief debate Members sought and received clarification regarding the change of use and its impact both by OFSTED and Planning regulations.

Members also discussed the possible overdevelopment and the access/egress arrangements of the site.

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 the extensions and alteration facilitated an increased degree of use reliant on inadequate on site garden space and parking provision thus representing a significant overdevelopment of the site harmful to the amenity of nearby residents and pedestrian safety within Sims Close.

133 **P1483.16 - 17-19 MARKET PLACE, ROMFORD**

The report before Members detailed an application for alterations and an extension to the existing building to create six flats with a retail unit at ground floor level. The residential accommodation would comprise of one 1-bedroom unit and five 2-bedroom units.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds that he believed it would be an enhancement to the streetscene and have little effect on views of the church.

With its agreement Councillor Frederick Thompson addressed the Committee.

Councillor Thompson commented that he had no objections to the proposal and believed it added charm to the Market streetscene and would help bring a little life back to the area. Councillor Thompson concluded that he believed the proposal would not affect the views of the nearby church and asked that the Committee supported the application.

During a brief debate Members discussed the possible improvements to the streetscene that the proposal would bring to the area.

Members also discussed the building's relationship to the church house situated adjacent, which was a listed building, and commented that there were concerns about separating the two buildings during the construction stage.

The application was recommended for refusal however following a motion to approve the granting of planning permission which was carried 8 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission contrary to recommendation subject to prior completion of a legal agreement for school place contribution and subject to imposing planning conditions to be decided by the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services, to include:

- Conditions designed to enable protection for the adjoining listed building during demolition and construction.
- Conditions requiring robust detail and execution of external design and materials.

The application would be referred back to the Committee if the legal agreement was not agreed.

The vote for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission was carried by 9 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions.

Councillors Misir, J. Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, White, Ower, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to delegate the granting of planning permission.

Councillors Hawthorn and Nunn abstained from voting.

#### 134 **P1430.16 - 587 UPPER BRENTWOOD ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing property and the construction of a new two-storey building comprising a physiotherapy practice (D1 use) to the front part of the ground floor, and a three-bedroom dwelling occupying the ground floor rear and first floor areas of the building. The front/side garden area would be paved over to form a car park providing six off-street car parking spaces (including one accessible bay), accessed via the existing double driveway arrangement.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Melvin Wallace as he believed that the current bungalow on this site was an eyesore and the proposed development would enhance the area and add a new business to Gidea Park.

During a brief debate Members sought and received clarification of the access/egress arrangements and opening hours of the proposed business.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion to grant planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that it be delegated to the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission contrary to recommendation subject to planning conditions to be decided by the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services and to include:

- Opening hours to start no earlier than 8.30am.
- Submission, approval, implementation and maintenance of a scheme of soft landscaping to include hedging to screen the new front parking area and create a buffer with the adjoining residential occupier.

135 **P0157.16 - LAND AT ALDI STORES, MARLBOROUGH ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for alterations to the existing car park layout and provision of additional car parking on adjacent land to serve the existing foodstore, together with reinstatement of the former community allotment on the remainder of adjacent land, and associated landscaping and works.

The application had previously been presented to the Regulatory Services Committee of 15 September 2016.

During the previous debate Members discussed the proposed works and the benefits they would bring to the area. The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion to approve planning permission it was resolved to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission, contrary to recommendation, subject to conditions and the prior completion of a legal agreement to cover:

- A clause requiring reversion of site to Green Belt open land on cessation of car park use by Aldi
- £12,000 financial contribution to nearby public open space
- plus imposition of conditions to be decided by the Head of Regulatory Services but to include a maintenance scheme for the meadow area in perpetuity. The application was to be re-presented to the Committee for determination in the event that the legal agreement could not be satisfactorily negotiated.

The application was being brought back before the Committee as the applicant has queried the reasonableness of the clause requiring the reversion of the site to Green Belt open land and the linkage to Aldi and did not consider it necessarily reflected the nature of the debate and issues raised by Members at the meeting. The applicant had argued that the clause was not necessary as the land would remain in Green Belt use and that planning permission would be required for all future development so the use as a car park should not present a greater risk of further development in the Green Belt in the future.

Officers had accepted that the site would remain in the Green Belt and that further forms of development would require planning permission. However did not agree with the applicant in terms of the potential pressure for allowing further development on the site, given that it would become previously developed land, albeit within the Green Belt.

It was officers understanding that Members wanted a clause requiring the land to be returned to undeveloped land in the event of the cessation of the use of the car park. The report had been brought back to the Committee for Members to provide clarity on the intention of the clause in question and for Members to consider if, in fact, it was necessary for the site to be reverted to undeveloped land when the car park was no longer required.

With its agreement Councillor Jason Frost addressed the Committee.

Councillor Frost commented that the land remained in the Green Belt and that any subsequent change to the land would require planning permission.

Following a brief debate in which Members sought and received clarification as to the possible future use of the land and possible restrictions it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services to go back to applicant to seek their agreement to completing a Section 106 agreement with an amended clause requiring the physical reversion back to undeveloped land, including the removal of any hardstanding, on cessation of the car park use for retail purposes and subject to their completion to grant planning permission subject to planning conditions to be determined by the Assistant Director of Regulatory Services. If the legal agreement was not completed as above then officers would refuse planning permission as per the original recommendation.

136 **P0272.16 - FROG ISLAND, FERRY LANE, RAINHAM - PROPOSED NEW OFFICE AND WORKSHOP BUILDING**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposal qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £22,400 and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

137 **P1165.16 - 27 LEWES ROAD, ROMFORD - PROPOSED CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING DWELLING INTO A FIVE BEDROOM HMO WITH INDEPENDENT W/C WITHIN EACH BEDROOM. SHARED KITCHEN AND GROUND FLOOR W/C**

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

138 **P1210.16 - UNIT 4B, BERNARD ROAD, ROMFORD - RETROSPECTIVE CHANGE OF USE FROM A LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT TO AN ADMINISTRATION OFFICE WITH GROUND FLOOR VEHICLE STORAGE AREA**

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

139 **P1418.16 - UNIT 12A AND 12B THE BREWERY, ROMFORD - CHANGE OF USE OF UNIT 12B FROM A1 (RETAIL USE) TO A3 (RESTAURANT USE) TOGETHER WITH EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE NEW ENTRANCE DOORS TO UNIT 12A AND 12B**

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

140 **P1421.16 - 1 MOWBRAYS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the demolition of the existing bungalow, ancillary buildings and garage block and the construction of four new dwellings plus ancillary facilities.

During a brief debate Members sought and received clarification of the parking provision and access/egress arrangements for the proposal.

The Committee noted that the proposal qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £4,780 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 under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £18,000 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 Assistant Director 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 and to add an additional condition requiring submission, approval, implementation and maintenance of a scheme of screening based on boundary treatment and landscaping for the four space car parking area designed to mitigate the effect of headlight disturbance and exhaust fumes on the rear garden environment and amenity of neighbouring properties.



141 **P1249.16 - HEXAGON HOUSE 5 MERCURY GARDENS, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the erection of seventy one flats on top of the existing Hexagon House building.

During a brief debate Members sought and received clarification on a number of points in relation to the proposal including whether an impact assessment had been carried out on the surrounding roads and whether there was sufficient amenity space for future residents.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 6 votes to 5 it was **RESOLVED** that the granting of planning permission be refused on the grounds of:

- The significant extension to a former office building converted to residential use would result in an overall number, mix and arrangement of flats – especially those 2 bed and larger likely to be occupied by families with children – which would represent a cramped, unduly intense occupation of the site, failing to achieve the quality of living conditions to justify a building of this height and density.
- The development's height would be materially out of keeping with the scale of adjacent buildings and thereby harmful to the townscape within Western Road.
- Failure to secure legal agreement for contributions for school places and affordable housing.

The vote for the resolution to refuse planning permission was carried by 6 votes to 5.

Councillors Kelly, Hawthorn, Nunn, Whitney, Martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to refuse planning permission.

Councillors Misir, Crowder, Wallace, White and Ower voted against the resolution to refuse planning permission.

142 **P1339.16 - ABERCROMBIE HOUSE, BRIDGWATER ROAD, HAROLD HILL - SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF THE EXISTING RESTRICTED RECEPTION AREA.**

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

143 **P1609.16 - MOUNTBATTEN HOUSE, ELVET AVENUE - INTERNAL MODIFICATIONS AND REAR EXTENSION TO GROUND FLOOR OF THE TOWER BLOCK TO PROVIDE A TENANTS MANAGEMENT ORGANISATION OFFICE AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES**

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

144 **P1532.16 - CROWNFIELD JUNIOR SCHOOL, WHITE HART LANE - NEW MODULAR BUILDING TO THE JUNIOR SCHOOL, CONSISTING OF 4 NO. CLASSROOMS AND TOILETS AND A NEW NETBALL COURT WITH A CANOPY OVER**

The Committee considered the report and following a motion to defer consideration of the report which was lost by 4 to 7 **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 7 votes to 2 with 2 abstentions.

Councillors Martin and Williamson voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Nunn and Whitney abstained from voting.

145 **P1528.16 - CROWNFIELD INFANTS SCHOOL, WHITE HART LANE - PROPOSED SCHOOL EXPANSION WHICH WILL CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING: A NEW STAND ALONE BUILDING TO EXPAND THE INFANTS SCHOOL CONSISTING OF 4 NO. CLASSROOMS, TOILETS AND A HALL, WIDENING OF AN EXISTING FOOTPATH, REPOSITIONING OF AN EXISTING FENCE, RE- POSITIONING OF PITCH MARKINGS, THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BRICK STORES, BREAKING OUT A LARGE CONCRETE SLAB AND THE FORMATION OF A NEW PLAYGROUND**

The Committee considered the report and following a motion to defer consideration of the report which was lost by 4 to 7 **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 7 votes to 3 with 1 abstention.

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

Councillor Whitney abstained from voting.

146 **P1097.16 - 69 NEWTONS CLOSE, RAINHAM - PART RETENTION OF AN EXISTING OUTBUILDING TOGETHER WITH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO ENABLE CONVERSION TO A GRANNY ANNEXE**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that the application was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following:

- That the residential annexe hereby approved shall be permanently retained as an annexe to the existing dwelling at 69 Newtons Close, Rainham and shall not be sub-divided or sold off separately from the main dwelling.
- 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 Assistant Director 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.

147 **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**