

# Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
Council Chamber - Town Hall  
12 January 2017 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

**Present:**

<b>COUNCILLORS:</b>	11
<b>Conservative Group</b>	Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace, Steven Kelly, Michael White and +Carol Smith
<b>Residents' Group</b>	Stephanie Nunn and Reg Whitney
<b>East Havering Residents' Group</b>	Alex Donald and Linda Hawthorn
<b>UKIP Group</b>	Phil Martin
<b>Independent Residents Group</b>	Graham Williamson

An apology was received for the absence of Councillor Ray Best.  
+Substitute member Councillor Carol Smith (for Ray Best)

Councillors Linda Van den Hende, Damian White and Ron Ower 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.

**159 P1549.16 - ASHBROOK NURSING HOME, 217 CHASE CROSS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members proposed a Section 73 application for an extension to the nursing home that was originally granted in 2012. This provided for an extension over three floors, including a lower ground floor. Detailed plans were approved as part of the application. The development had not been constructed in accordance with these plans. This was an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

which seeks a new planning permission with revised plans that accord with what has been constructed.

The changes involve the extension of the first floor accommodation and changes to the roof and window details. The number of new bedrooms would remain the same at 28, however there would be additional rooms for staff and other internal layout changes including relocating stairs. The plans also show other minor changes including relocation of fire escape, inclusion of entrance canopy, internal layout changes, infilling of small light well and revised parking layout that entail a minor adjustment to the footprint of the building.

During the debate Members discussed the use of the additional seven rooms by staff at the home and if more parking spaces were required. It was clarified to the Committee that the bedrooms at the home remained the same.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion for approval of planning permission which was carried by 7 votes to 3 and 3 abstentions it was **RESOLVED** that Section 73 application be granted subject to conditions covering:

- Full accordance with approved plans;
- 10 parking spaces carried forward from previous permission;
- No flank windows;
- And (if development not completed) constructions hours; materials, method statement and , landscaping, screening for lower ground floor Avelon Road, Transport Plan, refuse storage and Secure by Design as per previous discharge of condition approvals.

#### 160 **P1706.16 - 41 PARKLAND AVENUE, UPMINSTER**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the demolishing and replacing the existing side garage, utility room, and part of the kitchen to enable the erection of a two storey side extension together with a single storey rear extension. The proposed works also included a new front porch and replacing an existing first floor rear window with double doors together with a metal guard-rail to create a 'Juliette' balcony.

The ground floor area of the proposed side and also part of the proposed rear extension would create an annexe with self-contained facilities including a bedroom, bathroom and kitchen/lounge.

The proposal detailed that the annexe would be occupied by the applicant's father who required some degree of care and the annexe was not intended to be used as a separate unit which was not ancillary to the main house.

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 he had lived in his property for twenty years and raised concern on the developments that proposed to build up to his boundary wall. It was stated that this would cause a lack of space to maintain boundary wall and sense of enclosure/tunnelling effect. The objector also stated loss of light in the area there was now inadequate amenity space for residents to use.

In response the applicant's agent commented that an identical build was been undertaken down the road and that all officer and architectural guidance had been incorporated in the proposal

The Committee noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Van den Hende on the grounds that the development raised concerns in regards to its impact upon neighbouring amenity, bulk and also its impact on the streetscene.

With its agreement Councillor Van den Hende addressed the Committee and reiterated her reasons for the call-in.

During the debate Members discussed the impact of the development on to the boundary wall of the objector. Members were of the view that the development would create a terrace effect and also considered the inability of objector to maintain his boundary wall and guttering.

Members discussed the character of the development on existing neighbouring properties, sought and received clarification on the location of the garage for the property and discussed the possible loss of light to neighbouring properties.

Following a motion to refuse planning permission which was carried lost 5 votes to 6 against, the Committee reverted to the recommendation in the report to grant planning permission, this was not carried by 5 votes to 6 votes against. Members returned to the motion to refuse planning permission which was carried by 6 votes to 5 and during the substantive vote, the motion was carried by 6 votes to 5 votes. Therefore it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds of:

- Excessive bulk, size and proximity to the boundary, unbalancing symmetry of the pair and creating a terracing effect so harm to streetscene.
- Overbearing and excessive enclosure effect on neighbouring properties (Nos.39 and 43) resulting from size and position of extension (single storey element for No.39 and single/two storey element for No.43).

161 **P1722.16 - 6 ELM PARADE, ST NICHOLAS AVENUE, ELM PARK**

The report before Members detailed an application which sought permission for a change of use from an A1 (retail) to an A5 use (hot food take-away). A new shop front was also proposed and an extraction flue would be erected to the rear of the property. The proposed A5 use would be open between 11 am and 11 pm.

The ground floor was currently occupied by a fruit & vegetable shop. The neighbouring properties within the parade consisted mainly of retail uses with residential apartment above. The parade was serviced from a lane to the rear. There were metred parking spaces outside the site and a Council run public car park opposite.

The Committee noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor John Mylod supporting the application on the grounds that if approved, the premises would add to the vibrancy of the area.

During a brief debate Members discussed the impact of an additional of the take away premises on the streetscene and parade. Members were of the view that there were too many A3/A5 uses already in the area and existing businesses. The Committee expressed concern on the impact of litter from the new business.

Following a brief debate the Committee **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as set out in the report.

162 **P1646.16 - HORSESHOE FARM COTTAGE, NORTH ROAD, HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER ROMFORD**

The report before Members detailed an application which sought consent for the conversion of the existing stable block into an annexe for use in association with the adjacent bungalow, known as Horseshoe Farm Cottage. In order to achieve this, the proposal would also involve the extension of residential curtilage of The Cottage to include the stable block.

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

163 **P1712.16 - 125 MUNGO PARK ROAD, RAINHAM**

The report before members sought planning permission for the change of use from A1 Retail to D2 Assembly and Leisure for the development of a soft play children's centre and a cafe.

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

164 **P1795.16 - UNIT 1 GALLOWS CORNER RETAIL PARK, ROMFORD**

The report before members sought planning permission for the erection of an internal mezzanine floor comprising 697 square metres of additional Class A1 retail floorspace.

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**

This page is intentionally left blank