

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
21 August 2014 (7.30 - 9.20 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Ray Best, Philippa Crowder, Steven Kelly,
+John Crowder and +Carol Smith

Residents' Group Ron Ower (in the Chair), Linda Hawthorn,
Stephanie Nunn and Nic Dodin

UKIP Group Phil Martin

**Independent Residents
Group** Graham Williamson

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Robby Misir and Michael White.

+Substitute members: Councillor John Crowder (for Michael White) and Councillor Carol Smith (for Robby Misir).

Councillors Roger Ramsey, Damian White, Melvin Wallace and David Durant were also present for parts of the meeting.

22 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.

46 P1015.13 - 6-7-8 CRANHAM HALL MEWS, THE CHASE, 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.

47 **A0032.14 - 7 CHASE CROSS ROAD, ROMFORD**

Officers requested that consideration of the item be deferred to allow the Member who had called in the application the opportunity to attend and explain the reasons for calling in the application.

48 **P0727.14 - 4 BURY FARM COTTAGES, ST MARY'S LANE, 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.

49 **P0872.14 - THE FOREST CENTRE, BROADFIELDS FARM, PIKE LANE, 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.

50 **P0251.14 - HARE LODGE, UPPER BRENTWOOD ROAD, ROMFORD**

The proposal before the Committee sought permission for the erection of a detached 2-storey three bedroom detached dwelling with associated parking on the southern part of the garden of Hare Lodge.

The site was situated within the Gidea Park Special Character Area. There were two preserved trees on site, subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and other trees within the site, mainly to the frontage, which were not subject to the TPO.

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

The objector commented that the proposed scheme was a rear garden development that was excessively cramped in its relationship with Hare Lodge. The objector also commented that it was wholly out of keeping in its relationship with the nearby dwellings in Cranbrook Drive.

The objector also commented that the development was close to the boundaries of the site and lack of amenity space would result in a cramped, over-development of the site materially harmful to and out of character with surrounding development, the Gidea Park Special Character Area and streetscene.

With its agreement Councillors Melvin Wallace and David Durant addressed the Committee.

Councillor Wallace raised objection to the development of the garden of Hare Lodge, a historical building in the borough. Councillor Wallace raised concerns regarding the proposal, making particular reference to the flat roof of the previous application. Councillor Wallace commented that he saw no difference in the current application that was designed to have a hipped roof. He added that the new development would not maintain or enhance the Gidea Park Special Character that also conflicted with Havering Policy DC69.

Councillor Durant commented in his objection that the development was contrary to the Gidea Park Special Character Policy. Councillor Durant also raised concerns regarding the previous proposal for the roof and the current hipped roof. Councillor Durant commented that both designs were detrimental to and would have an overbearing effect on Hare Lodge.

During a brief debate members raised concerns on the impact that the development would have on the streetscene and on amenities and parking in the neighbouring 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:

- That the attempt to integrate a pitched roof onto a modernist architecturally themed building created a weak, discordant design which would be incongruous to the setting of Hare Hall Lodge and be materially harmful to the character of the Gidea Park Special Character Area.

51 **P0324.14 - 41-43 MAYLANDS AVENUE & 70 CORONATION DRIVE, ELM PARK**

The application before members was for the demolition of the existing single storey office building and the erection of a two storey building to form five two bedroom flats. There would be 2 two bedroom flats on the ground floor with a further two on the first floor and one in the loft.

During a brief debate members raised concerns on the impact that the development would have on the streetscene and on amenities and parking in the area.

Members raised concerns regarding the lack of adequate parking spaces for each of the properties taking into account the parking restrictions in the surrounding area. Members commented that since the approval of the original application, the revised application before them appeared to be an over-development of the site. Several Members had concerns regarding the additional apartment in the loft and the proposed dormer windows which could have a dominant effect on surrounding houses and lead to issues of overlooking.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to defer the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred to allow officers to contact the applicant for further clarification of the following:

- Parking restrictions in the area in context of the ratio of on-site parking proposed including possibility of CPZ 106 resolution if relevant.
- Dormer relationship to Maylands Avenue and degree of overlooking of properties.

52 **P0483.14 - 99 FRONT LANE, CRANHAM, 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.

53 **P1020.12 - 69 OLDCHURCH ROAD, ROMFORD**

The Committee considered the report, noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £33,656.80 and without debate **RESOLVED** that the proposal was unacceptable as it stood but would be acceptable subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), to secure the following:

- Save for those holding blue badges restriction on residents of the development applying for parking permits within the local area.
- A financial contribution of £216,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs.
- 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.
- To pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in association with the preparation of a legal agreement irrespective of whether the legal agreement is completed.
- Payment of the appropriate planning obligation/s monitoring fee.

That staff be authorised to enter into a legal agreement to secure the above and upon completion of that agreement, the Committee delegated authority to the Head of Regulatory Services to grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

54 **P0809.14 - 13 BURNTWOOD AVENUE, HORNCHURCH**

The report before members concerned an outline planning application for the demolition of an existing care home and the erection of four new dwellings and an access road.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillors Ron Ower and Roger Ramsey.

Councillor Ower requested that the application be called in to Committee, on the grounds of the planning history for the site and traffic movements. Councillor Ramsey requested that the application be called in to committee, in view of its impact on adjoining properties.

The Committee noted that a late letter of representation had been received that raised concern about the development being too near to adjoining properties.

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 scheme would set a precedent for others to follow and as such would cause harm to the local area. The objector also commented that the infill development would not produce plot sizes equivalent to surrounding properties and also added that the layout was inappropriate and the plot width of one of the dwellings did not strictly comply with Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Emerson Park Policy Area. The objector also commented on the impact of the access road on neighbour's amenity with particular reference to number eleven Burntwood Avenue with issues arising from traffic and service vehicles.

In response, the applicant's representative had distributed a submission that detailed the proposal within the policy context, identifying areas that had been addressed from the previous refusal such as the overlooking and justifying elements of the scheme that remained unchanged. Reference was made to the significant gaps between the proposed and existing properties.

With its agreement Councillor Roger Ramsey addressed the Committee.

Councillor Ramsey commented that he had concerns regarding the application in view of its impact on adjoining properties and density. Councillor Ramsey also raised concern concerning the disturbance to amenity caused by the relationship of the access road to neighbour's houses.

During the debate members raised concerns regarding the application including the possibility of the development being a back garden development that would harm the character of Emerson Park area.

Members also received clarification regarding boundary distances and the Fire Services' comments regarding the application.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission which was carried by 10 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the layout of the plot and penetration of the built form would have on the rear open area. The development was out of keeping with and harmful to the character of the Emerson Park area. The physical plot width of the left hand frontage of the house failed to comply with the twenty three metres minimum plot width requirements, thereby harming the streetscene. There would be noise, disturbance and harm to local amenity caused by the relationship of the access road to neighbouring properties.

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

Councillor Phil Martin abstained from voting.

55 P0853.14 - PYRGO PRIMARY SCHOOL, SETTLE ROAD, HAROLD HILL

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

56 P1357.13 - FORMER PETROL FILLING STATION, ADJACENT 2A SUTTONS LANE, HORNCHURCH

The Committee considered the report and were updated on a late letter of representation and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

57 STOPPING UP ORDER - GARRICK HOUSE

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that subject to the payment of the disbursements costs pursuant to advertising notices that:

- The Council makes a Stopping Up Order to stop up highway under the provisions of s.247 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) in respect of the areas of grass verge (highway) zebra hatched black on the attached plan 12040_103, as the land was required to enable development for which the Council had granted

planning permission under planning reference P0665.13 to be carried out to completion, specifically the construction of a parking area.

- In the event that no relevant objections were made to the proposal or that any relevant objections that were made are 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 can 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.

58 **ENFORCEMENT REPORT - 30 ELMS CLOSE**

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

- (1) The height of the building hatched black on the plan attached must be reduced to 2.5metres.
- (2) Remove from the Land at 30 Elms Close, Hornchurch, all rubble and waste material resulting from compliance with (1) above.

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

59 **ENFORCEMENT REPORT - TYAS STUD FARM**

Members considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** it to be expedient that an Enforcement Notice be issued and served to require, within 6 months of the effective date of the enforcement notice:

1. Cease the unauthorised use of the Land, for residential purposes.
2. Cease the use of the Land for the parking of vehicles.
3. Cease the use of the Land for storage purposes (associated with the unauthorised use).
4. Remove from the Land all mobile homes, caravans, vehicles, sheds, fences, decking, septic tanks, goods, machinery, rubbish, apparatus, equipment associated and installations brought onto the Land in connection with the unauthorised use.

5. Remove all hardstanding and materials deposited on the Land in connection with the unauthorised development.
6. Reinstate the Land to a condition suitable for rough grazing uses.

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

Chairman