

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
25 June 2015 (7.30 - 8.45 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS:** 11

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

**Residents' Group** Reg Whitney and +Jody Ganly

**East Havering Residents' Group** Linda Hawthorn and +Darren Wise

**UKIP Group** Phil Martin

**Independent Residents Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Philippa Crowder, Alex Donald and Stephanie Nunn.

+Substitute members: Councillor Michael White (for Philippa Crowder), Councillor Darren Wise (for Alex Donald), and Councillor Jody Ganly (for Stephanie Nunn).

Councillor Ron Ower was also present for the meeting.

30 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.

**294 P0592.15 - SULLENS FARM, SUNNINGS LANE, UPMINSTER**

The report before Members sought planning permission for the conversion of existing brick barns to create three new apartments, demolition of modern barns, to allow construction of five new houses, removal of external caravan storage use, a hard surfaced yard and replacement with landscaping.

The application site lay in the Green Belt and included a Grade II listed building and associated outbuildings. The application followed the refusal of similar proposals on the grounds of the adverse impacts on the Green Belt,

on the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers and on the setting of the listed building. The proposals had been further reduced in scale by removing one property and increasing the buffer with adjoining properties. This reduced the scale of the development and its associated impacts.

Members noted that the application together with the associated application for listed building consent had been called-in by Councillor Ron Ower on the grounds of the planning history of the site and Green Belt issues.

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 proposal would attract extra traffic to the site, result in a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties and also disregard the openness of the Green Belt. The objector also commented that the proposed development was not in keeping with the area.

In reply the applicant's representative commented that the comments raised at the previous meeting had been listened to and along with a reduction in the units now proposed there had also been the inclusion of additional landscaping and the car parking area had been reduced. The representative also commented that the changes benefitted all the neighbouring properties and that the proposed dwellings would be of the same scaling as the existing barns whilst also additionally tidying up an untidy commercial site.

With its agreement Councillor Ron Ower addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ower commented that there appeared to be very little change from the previous application. Councillor Ower also commented that the site was a fundamental part of the Green Belt and that allowing planning permission could be setting a dangerous precedent.

During a brief debate Members discussed the changes that had been made to the application and agreed that the changes were minor and that no special circumstances existed for development on Green Belt land.

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

- Noise disturbance given the proximity to the adjoining residential property.
- Scale and bulk of the proposed buildings detracting from the openness of the Green Belt.
- Scale and bulk of the proposed buildings detracting from the open setting of heritage assets
- Absence of any mechanism to secure planning obligations

295 **L0003.15 - SULLENS FARM, SUNNINGS LANE, UPMINSTER**

Following consideration of application P0592.15 where planning permission had been refused by the Committee it was considered premature to grant listed building consent when no suitable planning permission was in place.

The report recommended that listed building consent be granted however following refusal of planning permission for the development for which listed building consent was sought it was **RESOLVED** that listed building consent be refused on the grounds that

It would be premature and unsupportable to grant listed building consent for a development for which planning permission was refused.

296 **P1754.14 - THE POMPADOURS, EDENHALL ROAD, ROMFORD**

The application before Members was for the redevelopment of the site to create 25 units, comprising 11 houses, 7 maisonettes and 7 flats. The site was currently occupied by a public house, including car park, beer garden and rear amenity areas. The public house included first floor residential accommodation.

Members noted that email submissions had been received from Councillors Julie Wilkes and Philip Hyde detailing their concerns regarding the proposed development and the lack of local services e.g GPs and school places.

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

The objector commented that the proposal would lead to additional traffic using an already busy junction on Hilldene Avenue. The objector also commented that there would be insufficient parking for residents and visitors of the development and that there would be a loss of sunlight for residents of neighbouring properties.

In reply the applicant's representative commented that the public house would be closing by the end of the year and that the plans submitted were mindful of the existing building materials and had maintained a traditional feel to the proposed development. The representative also commented that there would be new trees planted and the creation of a courtyard area plus parking for 42 cars and the provision of cycle storage.

During a brief debate Members discussed the density of the development and the lack of amenity provided.

Member's consensus was that if the proposal had been for houses and not a flatted development then it would have been more befitting to the surrounding neighbourhood.

Members also discussed the lack of affordable housing and what was seen as an excessive overdevelopment of the site which in turn would lead to overlooking of the small gardens.

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 on the grounds of:

- Excessively dense and cramped development creating an excessively tall and bulky built form harmful to the streetscene and out of character with surroundings.
- Cramped overdevelopment in which internal arrangement failed to provide rear garden environment of sufficient form and quality to meet future residents' needs.
- Interlocking within the scheme harmful to future residents' amenity.
- Failure to provide contributions to mitigate impact on infrastructure needs, affordable housing and CO<sub>2</sub> off-setting.

297 **P1356.14 - LAND AT 215-227 ST MARY'S LANE, UPMINSTER - ERECTION OF EIGHT NEW DWELLINGS**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £17,480 and that the infrastructure contribution was to be amended to read £48,000, and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- A financial contribution of £48,000 to be used for educational purposes.
- 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 the planning obligation to secure the above contribution and upon completion of that obligation, grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to include an additional condition requiring submission,

approval, implementation and maintenance of a scheme to control tandem parking allocation.

298 **P0634.15 - 65 LAMBS LANE SOUTH, RAINHAM - ALTERATION OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AT 65 LAMBS LANE SOUTH ALONG WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW SELF CONTAINED BUNGALOWS TO THE REAR OF THE SITE**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL contribution of £7,460, and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Deed of Variation under Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to vary the Unilateral Undertaking completed on 3 July 2014 (the original agreement) in respect of planning permission P0400.14 by varying the definition of Proposed Development in Recital D, Planning Application and Planning Permission in Clause 1 of the original agreement which shall mean either Proposed Development planning permission P0400.14 as originally granted or planning permission P0634.15.

Save for the variation set out above and necessary consequential amendments the Unilateral Undertaking dated 3rd July 2014 and all recitals, terms, covenants and obligations in the said Unilateral Undertaking dated 3 July 2014 will remain unchanged, a summary of which is set out below:

- A financial contribution of £12,000 towards the infrastructure costs arising from the development would be required to fulfil the requirements of the Planning Obligations SPD.
- 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.

---

**Chairman**