

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
23 April 2015 (7.30 - 9.05 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Robby Misir (in the Chair) Ray Best (Vice-Chair),
Philippa Crowder, Steven Kelly and +Melvin Wallace

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

An apology was received for the absence of Councillor Michael White.

+Substitute members: Councillor Melvin Wallace (for Michael White).

Councillors Roger Ramsey, Frederick Thompson and John Glanville 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.

248 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

249 P0146.15 - 2 WALDEN WAY, HORNCHURCH

The application before Members sought planning permission for demolition of the existing detached bungalow and garage/store and the erection of a

new detached house with integral garage plus the erection of a new front wall and gates.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Ron Ower on the grounds of the size of the proposed dwelling and by Councillor Roger Ramsey on the grounds of the impact on the adjoining property.

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

The representative advised that he was speaking on behalf of the owners of the adjacent property to the application site. The representative commented that application site was a triangular plot and that previous applications though different to the current proposal to develop on the site had been refused following appeals to the Planning Inspectorate. The representative considered that the planning inspectorates decision to refuse previous applications material. The representative also commented that the current application was for a much bigger two storey property which would have an overbearing effect, lead to a loss of light and create a sense of enclosure for the neighbouring property.

In reply the applicant commented that the application had met with all the planning policies and that no overlooking would arise from the proposed development. The applicant also commented that the application site was surrounded by seven two storey properties and that the design had been sympathetic to neighbouring properties. The applicant also confirmed that letters of support for the development had been received from over thirty neighbouring properties.

With its agreement Councillors John Glanville and Roger Ramsey addressed the Committee.

Councillor Glanville commented that the applicants had been suffering with problems of damp, mould and Asbestos in the current dwelling. Councillor Glanville commented that the key factor in the application was the wedge shaped plot. Officers had mentioned planning policy DC61 in their support of the scheme however DC61 also stated that developments must respect the surrounding physical context. Councillor Glanville also commented on the Planning Inspectorates previous comments that the mass of the proposed development would result in a unpleasantly overbearing effect on the neighbouring property. Councillor Glanville considered that the massing of the development may conflict with Policy DC61 and considered that it was a judgement call for Members to make.

Councillor Ramsey commented that the proposal was a judgement call and needed careful consideration from the Committee. Councillor Ramsey also commented on the triangular nature of the plot and considered that the height and bulk of the proposed development would have an impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

During the debate Members received clarification of the distance of the current dwellings and the proposed dwellings from neighbouring property. Members also discussed the size of the plot and whether the development would impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property.

Members also received clarification on the aspect of the proposed development which confirmed that there would be no overlooking onto the neighbouring property. Officers confirmed the fenestration arrangements for the development would include obscured glass to the only window facing the neighbouring property.

Following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was lost by 3 votes to 7 with 1 abstention it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The vote for the resolution to grant permission was carried by 7 votes to 3 with 1 abstention.

Councillors Misir, Best, Crowder, Kelly, Wallace, Hawthorn and Ower voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

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

Councillor Williamson abstained from voting.

250 **P1120.14 - THE BREWERY SHOPPING CENTRE, ROMFORD**

The application before Members detailed an application to demolish an existing retail pavilion, Erection of a two-storey drive-through restaurant (688sqm) in use classes A3 and A5, Erection of a stand-alone, single storey commercial building to provide 107sqm in Use Class A1 and/or A2 and/or A3, Erection of a welfare building for use by bus drivers (33sqm), Erection of a stand-alone refuse and recycling storage building (15sqm) and re-arrangement and re-provision of a bus interchange.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds of:

Additional traffic and noise due to 24 hour opening would could impact on Waterloo Road residents, especially from unnecessarily loud music

Additional littering in the bus area at night

Light pollution from illuminated signs

Extra congestion during daylight hours on roundabout blocking A118.

Delivery vehicles may also lead to queues due to difficulties in accessing site

Could encourage dangerous traffic movements connected with bus egress

Members were advised that a letter of representation had been received from Councillor Joshua Chapman objecting to the scheme on the grounds of the 24 hour opening, loitering and increased litter.

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

The objector commented that the A118 ring road was a main TfL route through the town centre that already suffered from gridlocking on occasions. The objector also commented that noise and air pollution would rise from increased vehicle movements and that the opening times of the restaurant and drive-thru were excessive.

In reply the applicant's representative commented that the development was replacing a similar suite of uses in the area, that the Council's streetcare Department had not objected and TfL recommendations regarding traffic movements had been incorporated into the designs and that the effects on air quality had been assessed and considered acceptable.

With its agreement Councillor Frederick Thompson addressed the Committee.

Councillor Thompson commented that there would be an impact on the residents living in Waterloo gardens and instances of loud music, littering and vehicle movements would harm resident's amenity. Councillor Thompson also cited possible delivery vehicle movements as being harmful to traffic flow. Councillor Thompson voiced concerns in respect of proliferation of fast food outlets and the adverse affects on health and the light pollution from increased signage and use.

During the debate Members discussed possible increase in noise and pollution and the effect the restaurant could have on the town centre's limited Police resources.

Members received clarification from officers of the traffic routing system on the site and also discussed the opening times of both the restaurant and drive-thru.

Members paid particular attention to the comments made by the Metropolitan Police Designing Out Crime Officer which had recommended an earlier closing time for the restaurant as opposed to the drive-thru.

Following a motion to approve with additional conditions restricted opening hours for the restaurant and drive through and to provide CCTV which was approved by 7 votes in favour to 4 against it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to include the following additional condition:

- Restricting both the restaurant and the drive-through to opening only between 6.30am – 11.30pm on any day.
- Installation of CCTV.

The votes for the motion and resolution to grant planning permission were both carried by 7 votes to 4.

Councillors Misir, Hawthorn, Ower, Nunn, Whitney, martin and Williamson voted for the resolution to grant planning permission.

Councillors Best, Crowder, Kelly and Wallace voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

251 **P0261.15 - LODGE COTTAGE, THE CHASE, UPMINSTER**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the erection of one 2 storey detached dwelling with four bedrooms including living accommodation in the roof space.

The application followed the refusal of planning application P0902.14 in August 2014 for the erection of one detached dwelling. The refusal reasons related to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, the bulk and size of the proposed dwellings resulting in a visually intrusive form of development detrimental to the open character of the Green Belt, as well as harmful to the character of the Cranham Conservation Area.

Members noted the comments of a letter of representation from Councillor Lawrence Webb and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused as per the reasons contained within the report with the following amendment to reason number 3 to read:

- Removal of reference to Planning Obligations SPD
- Insertion of reference to Policy DC72.

The vote for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Councillor Martin abstained from voting.

252 **P1160.14 - 11 PARKSTONE AVENUE, HORNCHURCH**

The application before Members proposed the demolition of the existing detached dwelling and the re-development of the plot with a replacement detached five bedroom house and a boundary wall to the front.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Steven Kelly on the grounds that the applicant had altered substantially the original

rejected plan with the height being reduced considerably and the overall footprint being moved back from the neighbouring plots/road. The application was now one of judgment and the Committee was the best arena for this to be determined.

During a brief debate Members discussed the proposed development and how it would sit within the existing streetscene.

Members considered that the proposal was not unique and conformed with the Emerson Park SPD which afforded protection to large architecture within spacious grounds.

The report recommended that planning permission be refused however following a motion to grant planning permission which was carried unanimously it was **RESOLVED** to delegate to the Head of Regulatory Services the drafting of the precise wording of the following planning conditions to which the planning permission was subject :

- Time limit
- Landscaping and boundary treatment
- Submission of materials
- Visibility splay
- Obscure glazed windows
- Non-use of flat roofs as balconies
- Construction hours/construction method
- Permitted development

The reason for approval agreed by the committee was that the proposal resulted in a large, architecturally varied dwelling set in a spacious plot in keeping with other properties in the locality. Through the application's design it would integrate satisfactorily in the streetscene and would not cause any harm to amenity or safety as visibility impact could be mitigated through a planning condition. The development would therefore respect the character and amenities of Emerson Park in accordance with LDF policies and guidance.

253 **P0049.15 - MOSS LANE NURSERY, MOSS LANE, ROMFORD**

It was **RESOLVED** that consideration of this item be deferred at officer's request to have regard to the anticipated external legal advice on Section 106 obligations which had not yet been received.

Chairman