

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
8 January 2015 (7.30 - 9.20 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Ray Best (Vice-Chair),
Steven Kelly, Michael White and +Frederick Thompson

Residents' Group Stephanie Nunn and Reg Whitney

**East Havering
Residents' Group** Ron Ower and +Alex Donald

UKIP Group +Lawrence Webb

**Independent Residents
Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Philippa Crowder, Linda Hawthorn and Phil Martin.

+Substitute members Councillor Frederick Thompson (for Philippa Crowder), Councillor Alex Donald (for Linda Hawthorn) and Councillor Lawrence Webb (for Phil Martin).

17 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.

149 P1466.13 - 58 PARKWAY, GIDEA PARK, ROMFORD

The proposal before the Committee sought permission for the erection of a single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and a two storey rear extension and various alterations.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Robby Misir.

Councillor Misir requested that the application be called in to Committee, on the grounds that the impact on the conservation area should be considered by Members rather than at officer level.

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 size, scale and contemporary design of the proposed extensions would harm the immediate street scene and the wider Gidea Park Conservation Area. The speaker stated that the proposed side extension reduce the separation distance with the neighbouring property to approximately 1 meter creating an intrusive development.

In response, the applicant's representative noted that this was a sensitive site as it lay within the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The speaker commented that the proposal would result in an overall improvement to the street scene through the removal of an unsightly garage and general tidying up of the front elevation of the property. The speaker commented that there would be an overall improvement in the separation distance with the neighbouring properties. The speaker also noted that a number of the neighbouring properties had already been extended and these existing extensions were comparable to that being proposed.

During the debate Members considered the Gidea Park Conservation Area Policy. Members commented that the proposal failed to comply with the policy as it was unsightly and failed to leave sufficient separation distance with the neighbouring property. A motion was moved to refuse the application. The motion was not seconded.

Another member commented that the proposal would improve the street scene. Members commented that some of the existing extensions to neighbouring properties were more intrusive than that being proposed.

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 10 votes to 1.

Councillor Thompson voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

150 **P0122.14 LAND TO THE R/O 70 STRAIGHT ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before members was for a 2-bedroom detached bungalow to the rear of 70 and 70a Straight Road.

Members noted that two late letters of representation, objecting to the proposals, had been received detailing parking issues and an overdevelopment of the site.

The report detailed that the application had been called in by Councillor Steven Kelly on the grounds that Members should consider the proposal following the applicant reducing the number of bungalows from two to one.

During the debate members considered the distances between the bungalow and existing properties and possible overlooking and highway issues. A member noted that the application was materially similar to a number of previously approved former garage developments. Members commented on the current condition of the site and the need for additional residential accommodation within the borough.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to grant planning permission which was carried, it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the applicant completing a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) to secure a £6,000.00 infrastructure tariff together with any associated legal and monitoring fees and subject to conditions covering the following plus any further conditions that the Head of Regulatory Services considered reasonable:

- Standard Time Limit
- Accordance with plans
- Materials
- Landscaping
- Remove all permitted development rights
- No flank windows without consent
- Boundary treatment.

It was noted that if the applicant failed to complete the UU, then the application would be brought back to the Committee for further consideration.

It was also noted that the application would be liable for the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy in accordance with the London Plan Policy 8.3.

The reasons for approval were that the development provides a residential unit benefitting the boroughs housing stock without harm to character, amenity or street scene.

The vote for the resolution was carried by 9 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Ower voted against the resolution.

Councillor Williamson abstained from voting.

151 **P1381.14 - 39 NELMES WAY, HORNCHURCH**

The report before Members concerned a proposal to demolish the existing bungalow and the erection of a five bedroom two storey dwelling house of approximately 234sqm with accommodation in the roof and a conservatory on the southern side elevation. The proposal also comprised a detached out building of 41.8sqm and an outdoor swimming pool in the garden to the south east of the proposed dwelling.

Members noted that one late letters of representation had been received raising concerns over lorry movements at a nearby junction during construction.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Ron Ower on the grounds of consistency with other decisions in the area.

During the debate members discussed the changing character of Emerson Park and whether the proposal was in keeping with these changes. A member noted that the plot was significant and could accommodate a substantial dwelling without it appearing overbearing or adversely affecting the street scene. Members noted that many of the properties in Emerson Park had already undergone significant extension and that this was now commonplace in the area.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused, however following a motion to grant planning permission which was carried, it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions plus any further conditions that the Head of Regulatory Services considered reasonable:

- Standard Time Limit
- Accordance with Plan
- Materials
- Landscaping
- Remove all permitted development rights
- No flank windows without consent
- Obscure glazing
- Working times
- Construction Method Statement
- Boundary treatment

It was also noted that a tariff did not apply but a Mayoral CIL would be applicable.

The reasons for approval were that the development was in keeping with the scale and setting of nearby residential buildings; did not harm the character of Emerson Park policy area; did not harm any aspects of amenity.

152 **P1540.14 - PARK CORNER FARM, PARK FARM ROAD, UPMINSTER**

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

153 **P1439.14 - WYKEHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL, RAINSFORD WAY, HORNCHURCH**

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

154 **P1103.14 - BUDDIES SCHOOL OF MOTORING, 9-11 CHASE CROSS ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members proposed the demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new A1 (retail) store on the ground floor with two, one bedroom self-contained flats above.

Members noted that one late letters of representation had been received raising concerns over opening hours, noise and parking congestion.

During the debate Members considered the arrangements for deliveries to the retail store. Members questioned whether sufficient thought had gone into the delivery and servicing arrangements and whether the restricted rear access way was sufficient to service the store. Members considered the possible effect of the delivery arrangements on highway traffic, particularly in the vicinity of the existing bus stop. Members considered the likely noise and general disturbance resulting from the movement of delivery trolleys through the access way.

Members raised concerns over the parking provision for the residential units questioning where vehicles associated with the residential units would be parked.

Members also discussed the proposed opening hours for the retail store and the arrangements for the removal of refuse from 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 for the following reasons:

- A cramped development that failed to provide sufficient onsite parking for all elements of the mixed retail and residential use. In particular, due to the complete absence of on-site parking for the new flats, vehicles associated with occupiers and visitors to these residential units would

have to be parked in surrounding roads to the detriment of amenity. Although future on street parking permits could be prevented by legal agreement there was no current controlled parking scheme in the vicinity of the site.

- A cramped development, the delivery and servicing arrangements for which would fail to serve the reasonable needs of the development and would rely upon delivery and service vehicle movements harmful to highway safety and pedestrian safety and amenity including in the vicinity of the existing bus stop in Clockhouse Lane.

155 **P1158.14 - 168 HORNCHURCH ROAD, HORNCHURCH**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £5,040 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £30,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs in accordance with the Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.
- All contribution sums shall 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 to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs associated with the Legal Agreement prior to the completion of the agreement irrespective of whether the agreement is completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligations monitoring fee prior to the 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.

156 **APPLICATION FOR THE STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY LAND ADJACENT TO 26 CURTIS ROAD, HORNCHURCH,**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that subject to the developer paying the Council's reasonable charges in respect of the making of, advertising of, any inquiry costs associated with and the

confirmation of the Stopping Up Order pursuant to Regulation 5 of The London Local Authorities (Charges for Stopping Up Orders) Regulations 2000 and subject to the lawful implementation of the Planning Permission that:-

- The Council made a Stopping Up Order under the provisions of s.247 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) in respect of the area of adopted highway shown zebra hatched on the Plan, being adopted highway verge, as the land was required to enable development for which the Council had granted the Planning Permission.
- In the event that no relevant objections were made to the proposal or that any relevant objections that were made were withdrawn then the Order be confirmed without further reference to the Committee.
- In the event that relevant objections were made, other than by a Statutory Undertaker or Transport Undertaker and not withdrawn, that the application be referred to the Mayor for London to determine whether or not the Council could proceed to confirm the Order.
- In the event that relevant objections were raised by a Statutory Undertaker or Transport Undertaker and were not withdrawn the matter may be referred to the Secretary of State for their determination unless the application was withdrawn.

157 **PLANNING CONTRAVENTION - 33 HORNMINSTER GLEN, HORNCHURCH**

Members considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that an Enforcement Notice be issued and served to require, within 3 months of the effective date of the enforcement notice:

- Removal of the unauthorised summerhouse.
- Removal from the Land all materials, rubble, machinery, apparatus and installations used in connection with or resulting from compliance with (i) above.

In the event of non compliance, and if deemed expedient, that proceedings be instituted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

158 **PLANNING CONTRAVENTION - 203 UPPER RAINHAM ROAD,
HORNCHURCH**

Members considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that an Enforcement Notice be issued and served to require, within 3 months of the effective date of the enforcement notice:

- Cease using the outbuilding for residential purposes.
- Remove from the outbuilding all fixtures and fittings associated with its unauthorised residential use.

In the event of non compliance, and if deemed expedient, that proceedings be instituted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Chairman