

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
3 August 2017 (7.30 - 10.30 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group	Robby Misir (Chairman), Philippa Crowder, Melvin Wallace, Roger Westwood and Michael White
Residents' Group	Stephanie Nunn and Reg Whitney
East Havering Residents' Group	Alex Donald and Linda Hawthorn
UKIP Group	+Patricia Rumble
Independent Residents Group	Graham Williamson

+Substitute member: Councillor Patricia Rumble (for Phil Martin

Councillors David Durant, Jody Ganly, John Glanville, Dilip Patel, Ron Ower and Jeffery Tucker were also present for parts of the meeting.

No interest was declared at the meeting.

About 60 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.

289 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 29 June and 13 July April 2017 were agreed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

290 P0796.17 - 18 TYLE GREEN, HORNCHURCH

The proposal before Members sought retrospective planning permission for a front boundary brick wall and railings. The maximum height of the brick piers was 1metre.

Members noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Roger Ramsey on the grounds that the development was visually intrusive; that it was inconsistent with the open plan nature of the rest of the estate and was in breach of the covenant given to the Council when the estate was developed.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the Committee was addressed by an objector with no response from the applicant.

The objector commented that he had lived at his property for about 34 years. Members were informed that the wall would intrude on the openness of the rest of the estate and impact on the environment.

With its agreement Councillor John Glanville addressed the Committee.

Councillor Glanville commented that if the proposal was approved, many of the residents were of the opinion that it would lead to a change in the nature of the estate. The proposal was not consistent with the open plan of the estate and was visually intrusive.

During the debate Members discussed the impact that the proposals would have on other properties on the estate, it was considered to be out of keeping with other homes in the area.

The report recommended planning permission be granted however subject to a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds of height and design of the wall resulting in visual intrusion and harm to character of the area which was particularly spacious and open.

291 **P0729.17 - 9 FAIRLAWNS, HORNCHURCH**

The proposal before Members was for the erection of one detached two-storey five-bedroom house and a detached double garage on a rectangular plot of land located to the south of a larger redevelopment site on land associated with the former property at 44 Herbert Road, and now referred to as 9 Fairlawns Close.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor John Glanville on the grounds that the departures which the developer had made from the original application, as approved by the planning Inspector, would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents living at nos. 6 and 7 Channing Close. Councillor Glanville also stated that the house had been moved forward by approximately two metres in order to fit the house into the site, and the south-east corner of the house had been altered to provide a much larger kitchen area.

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 current development had departed from the original planning permission which had stipulated that there should be no departure from the submitted plans. The objector concluded by commenting that the revised layout impacted on neighbours' amenities.

The applicant did not arrive to respond to the objector's comments.

With its agreement Councillor John Glanville addressed the Committee.

Councillor Glanville commented on the following two changes to the development; the larger kitchen area to the southeast corner which was of concern to house number 6 and the build of the house two metres forward which was of concern to house 7. Councillor Glanville also commented that the building work had commenced before planning permission was granted and that he was concerned that the visit undertaken by Members had not extended to neighbouring properties to view the impact on the neighbours. It was suggested that the Committee review arrangements so that it future Members would be able to visit neighbouring properties adjoining an application site.

Councillor Glanville noted that the building could not fit on to the site as it had been measured wrongly.

During the debate Members who visited the site were satisfied that the building would not have that much of an impact on neighbouring properties.

A motion to refused planning permission was proposed by Councillor Linda Hawthorn and seconded by Councillor Alex Donald.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was not carried by 4 votes to 6 and one abstention.

Councillors Donald, Hawthorn, Nunn and Rumble voted to refuse planning permission while Councillor Williamson abstained from voting.

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

The vote for the resolution to granting of planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 1 with two abstentions.

Councillor Hawthorn voted against the motion while Councillors Donald and Williamson abstained from voting.

The report before Members sought permission for the change of use of the first floor of the building to D2 (Gymnasium).

The report informed Members that within the supporting statement that it was stated that it was the intention of the applicant to offer personal training and group sessions.

The applicant currently operated out of a different site, however it was envisioned to transpose the arrangement to the new premises.

Members noted that the application had been called-in by Councillor Jody Ganly who had expressed concerns over increased demand for vehicle parking which would be to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

Councillor Jody Ganly considered that there were not enough parking spaces provided and that the roads around Rodwell House already suffered with parking congestion from St. Marys School, the nursery in Vicarage Road and the PSPO that was implemented at Wykeham School.

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

The objector made representation against the proposal that most people who would visit the gym would end up parking within the St Mary's Parish Church car park as the proposal had limited parking as part of the application.

In response the applicant's agent commented that the gym was primarily focused on personal training.

With its agreement Councillor Jody Ganly addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ganly commented that other ward councillors have objected to the proposal and that the main issues were parking and noise in the area.

During the debate Members discussed the issue of insufficient parking on the site and congestion and in the area.

A motion to refused planning permission was proposed by Councillor Reg Whitney and seconded by Councillor Stephanie Nunn.

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

- Insufficient off-street parking provision which would result in increased competition for on-street parking in an area already suffering parking stress from existing commercial and community

uses in the vicinity, resulting in inconvenience to existing residents and users of existing commercial/community facilities.

- Increased congestion through the proposal adding more vehicle movements in an area that already suffers congestion from existing commercial/community uses, particularly during peak times, resulting in inconvenience to existing residents and users of existing commercial/community facilities and increases in unsafe vehicle manoeuvres/parking endangering pedestrians and other road users.

Following the motion to refuse the granting of planning permission, the voting was carried by 7 votes to 3 and one abstention.

Councillors Philippa Crowder, Melvin Wallace and Roger Westwood voted against the resolution while Councillors Alex Donald abstained from the vote.

The voting for the resolution to refuse planning permission was 6 votes to 3 and two abstentions.

Councillors Linda Hawthorn, Robby Misir, Stephanie Nunn, Reg Whitney, Graham Williamson and Patricia Rumble voted in favour of the resolution while Councillors Alex Donald and Michael White abstained from the vote.

293 P0765.17 - 2 HAMLETS ROAD, ROMFORD

The proposal before Members sought planning permission for the erection of a new house.

Members noted that the site was a vacant rectangular plot, which was formerly occupied by a two-storey detached house, which was demolished in October 2015.

The report indicated that prior to the submission of the application, a planning permission (P1744.15) was granted by the Committee on 16 March 2016 for a new dwelling and construction works were currently underway. It was stated that the house had not been built in accordance with the previously approved plans as a basement area had been excavated. It was also noted that the applicant's intention was to replace roof light windows in the front roof slope with dormer windows, although this part of the development had not been undertaken.

The report stated that the current application sought to regularise the unauthorised basement works and the proposed amendments to the front roof level windows.

The application had been called-in by Councillor Dilip Patel on the grounds that the front dormer windows would directly overlook the gardens of the

property located opposite the development, thus evading the privacy of the residents on the opposite side.

Councillor Patel was also concerned that the property could be used later as a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO), he was of the opinion that the proposal was an over development of the site.

With its agreement Councillor Dilip Patel addressed the Committee.

Councillor Patel commented that there was going to be an impact to residents living opposite the proposed site. It was suggested that there would be an invasion to the privacy of residents on Hog Hill Road.

During the debate Members discussed the issue of overlooking to the four properties opposite the development and also commented that the proposal was an overdevelopment 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 the granting of planning permission be refused due to the impact of the dormer windows on neighbouring occupiers through loss of privacy and overlooking.

Following the motion to refuse the granting of planning permission, the voting was carried by 10 votes to 1.

Councillor Robby Misir voted against the resolution to refuse planning permission.

The voting for the resolution to refuse planning permission was 10 votes to 1.

Councillor Robby Misir voted against the resolution.

294 **P0046.17 - 11 QUEENS GARDENS, CRANHAM**

The proposal before Members sought approval to convert and extend the existing detached garage to a new detached chalet style bungalow 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 the proposal would impact on day light and sun light to her premises. The objector commented on the issue of impact on the road, height, bulk and mass on the streetscene.

In response the applicant's commented that all the objections raised in the previous application have been addressed and the current proposal had the approval of officers.

During the debate Members discussed the size of the rooms in the proposal and concluded that the size did not meet Havering standards. Members also commented on the impact of the proposal on streetscene existing properties.

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 on the grounds that:

- The additional height giving rise to harm in the streetscene.
- The additional height resulting in adverse impact upon neighbouring window.
- The failure to comply with London Plan Policy 3.5 (head height).
- The failure to provide contribution towards education contribution.

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

Councillor Robby Misir voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

295 **P0787.17 - HARE LODGE, UPPER BRENTWOOD ROAD**

The proposal before Members sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing house and the construction of a new residential development consisting of 8no. flats. The accommodation would comprise 4no. one bedroom units and 4no. two-bedroom units.

Members noted that the proposal raised considerations in relation to the impact on the Gidea Park special character area, the impact on the residential amenity of the future occupants and of neighbouring residents, and parking and access.

During the debate Members discussed the impact on the character of the area and street scene, that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site and would have an impact on the area of special character.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the following grounds that:

- The impact of building upon character of Special Character Area arising from amount of development/physical form.
- The failure to provide a contribution towards education provision.
- The failure to secure parking permit restriction.

The Committee agreed to make a request for the building to be listed as it was of the view it had a heritage that needed to be protected.

296 **P0306.17 - TESCO STORES LTD, BRIDGE ROAD RAINHAM**

The proposal before the Committee sought permission to install a pod on the Tesco superstore site to accommodate dry cleaning, key cutting, shoe & watch repairs business.

The application had been called-in by Councillor Jeffery Tucker on the grounds that a very similar proposal had previously been refused and that if allowed to go ahead the development would have a major impact on the Rainham Village community shopping centre.

With its agreement Councillor David Durant addressed the Committee.

Councillor Durant commented that he was of the opinion that the development would have a detrimental and adverse impact on the High Street and needed to be adjudged on the mega stores rules.

Councillor Tucker was of the view that the development was a fire risk at the entrance to the Tesco stores and trolley station. That the proposal would also have an impact on the viability of the Rainham Village shopping centre.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was also carried by 8 votes to 2 and one abstention.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that the granting of planning permission be refused on the grounds of the impact of pod upon viability of the High Street.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 6 votes to 2 and three abstentions.

Councillors Robby Misir and Melvin Wallace voted against the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission while Councillors Philippa Crowder, Roger Westwood and Michael White abstained from voting.

297 **A0012.17 - TESCO STORES LTD, BRIDGE ROAD RAINHAM**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as the Committee was unable to resolve the

proposal following the refusal of the accompanying application to install a pod on the site to accommodate dry cleaning, key cutting, shoe & watch repairs.

298 **P0882.17 - FARM HOUSE, EAST HALL LNE, WENNIGTON**

The proposal before Members sought planning permission for a two storey rear extension; a second storey extension; and a single storey rear extension.

With its agreement Councillor David Durant addressed the Committee. Councillor Durant suggested that conditions regarding enforcement on the farm and also raised issues on fly tipping in the area.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an extra informative that future extensions were unlikely to be granted..

299 **P0905.17 - RAILWAY SIDINGS CARAVAN SITE, OCKENDON ROAD, NORTH OCKENDON**

The application before Members sought planning permission for a traveller family to occupy the site, instead of the previous family as per the details originally approved as part of application ref: P0519.03. The application proposed no additional development with the application seeking to vary the personal restriction currently imposed on occupation of the site.

The application had been called in by Councillor Ron Ower on the basis of the proposal not being an inappropriate use of the Green Belt.

Councillor Ower commented that there were concerns from local residents following the history of the site. The Committee was requested to consider appropriate conditions and landscaping for the proposal.

The Committee received clarification that the relevant conditions were proposed to limit the number of families on the site and the replacement of the lighting to low level lighting. A Member requested that officers keep a close monitoring of the site.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report including an extra informative to convey the view that future extensions were unlikely to be granted.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 1 and two abstentions.

Councillor Patricia Rumble voted against the resolution to grant planning permission while Councillors Alex Donald and Linda Hawthorn abstained from the vote.

300 **P0950.17 - RAILWAY SIDINGS CARAVAN SITE, OCKENDON ROAD, NORTH OCKENDON**

The application before Members sought planning permission to utilise the complete site as a traveller site. The site would provide five pitches, each comprising a mobile home and utility block, with space for a touring van. The proposal also sought associated operational development that included the installation of lighting, fencing, walls and an electricity cabinet.

The application had been called in by Councillor Ron Ower on the basis of the proposal not being an inappropriate use of the Green Belt.

Councillor Ower commented that there were concerns from local residents following the history of the site. The Committee was requested to consider appropriate conditions and landscaping for the proposal.

The Committee received clarification that conditions were proposed to limit the number of families on the site and the replacement of the lighting to low level lighting. A Member requested that officers keep a close monitoring of the site.

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

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was carried by 9 votes to 1 and one abstention.

Councillor Melvin Wallace voted against the resolution to grant planning permission while Councillor Patricia Rumble abstained from the vote.

301 **P0645.17 - 14 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD**

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

302 **P0813.17 - THE PAVILLON, HALL LANE PLAYING FIELDS**

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

303 **P0938.17 - WARLEY 275KV ELECTRICITY SUBSTATION, CLAY TYE ROAD, WARLEY**

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

304 **P0569.17 - ST EDWARDS COURT**

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

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

Councillor Graham Williamson voted against the resolution to the granting of planning permission.

305 **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