

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
13 July 2017 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Melvin Wallace,
Michael White, Roger Westwood and +Carol Smith

Residents' Group Stephanie Nunn and +Nic Dodin

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

UKIP Group +John Glanville

**Independent Residents
Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Philippa Crowder, Reg Whitney and Phil Martin.

+Substitute members: Councillor Carol Smith (Philippa Crowder), Councillor Nic Dodin (for Reg Whitney) and Councillor John Glanville (for Phil Martin).

Councillors Frederick Thompson and Viddy Persaud 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.

284 P1812.16 - 226-232 MAIN ROAD, ROMFORD

The proposal before Members was for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a three-storey mixed use building, comprising of three ground floor commercial units and eight residential apartments in the upper floors.

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

The objector commented that a three-storey building would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area due to its prominent location, height, bulk and mass, and would be a visually intrusive feature in the streetscene. The objector also commented that the proposal contravened the Highways Act and Traffic Management Act due to obstruction and congestion. The objector concluded by commenting that there had been over a thousand objections to the proposal and not one recorded supporter.

In response the applicant commented that the proposal was for eight residential units and not nine as had been quoted in some places. The objector also commented that there was a family history relating to the premises and that the proposed residential units would be for future generations of the family. The applicant concluded by commenting that there were alternative car servicing providers within a short distance of the premises and that the submitted plans were correct and matched what was quoted in the officer's report.

With its agreement Councillor Frederick Thompson addressed the Committee.

Councillor Thompson commented that he had visited the site and that the proposed development would be out of keeping with the streetscene especially when compared to neighbouring buildings which were of a smaller nature. Councillor Thompson concluded by commenting that the proposal by bringing forward the building line in front of what was already there would contribute towards the bulk and massing of the building which would be unacceptable.

During the debate Members sought and received clarification of the proposal's dimensions and those of the neighbouring properties and also how close the proposed development would be to Gidea Lodge.

Members also discussed the need for more homes in the borough but agreed that they shouldn't be built at any cost and that the proposed development would not sit comfortably in the streetscene and would harm the conservation 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 for the following reasons:

1. Impact of the proposals upon the Gidea Park Conservation Area.
2. Lack of infrastructure contribution towards education provision.

285 **P2036.16 - 2 BROOKLANDS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before Members was for the demolition of all existing buildings on site and the construction of a two-storey building to provide eight two-bedroom flats and associated vehicular access, drainage works, landscaping and car parking for ten vehicles.

Members noted that a previous planning permission in August 2016 had been refused and a subsequent appeal to the Planning Inspectorate had been dismissed. The proposal before Members varied from the previous application.

Members also noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Robert Benham for the following reasons. The proposal was an overdevelopment of the site, cramped, lack of parking and amenity space, not in keeping with the local area and poor design.

Due to another commitment Councillor Benham was unable to address the Committee and had asked his fellow ward Councillor, Councillor Viddy Persaud, to speak on his behalf to the Committee.

Councillor Persaud commented that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site, cramped and would lead to a loss of light to neighbouring properties. Councillor Persaud also commented that the proposal was a back land development and that one of the current buildings on the site and the hardstanding had been built without planning permission. Councillor Persaud concluded by commenting that the proposal would lead to a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties by overlooking existing gardens, shortage of parking and narrow access/egress arrangements.

During the debate Members sought and received clarification on Highways objections and the enforcement history of the site.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 10 votes to 1 it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. Impact of the proposals upon outlook. By reason of height, bulk, design, scale and position the proposal would create an intrusive and overbearing development out of character with locality and harmful to amenity of neighbouring properties' outlook, privacy and rear garden enjoyment.
2. Lack of infrastructure contribution towards education provision.

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

Councillor Misir voted against the resolution.

286 **P0528.17 - 136 WENNINGTON ROAD, RAINHAM - RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR AN OUTBUILDING**

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

287 **P0611.17 - CLAY TYE FARM, CLAY TYE ROAD, UPMINSTER - PROPOSED ENERGY STORAGE FACILITY TO PROVIDE ENERGY BALANCING SERVICES TO THE NATIONAL GRID**

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

288 **P0687.17 - 16 KILN WOOD LANE, HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER, ROMFORD - LOFT CONVERSION TO FORM AN ADDITIONAL BEDROOM**

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

Chairman