

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
2 October 2014 (7.30 - 10.20 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS:** 11

**Conservative Group** Robby Misir (in the Chair) Ray Best, Philippa Crowder, Steven Kelly and Michael White

**Residents' Group** Linda Hawthorn, Ron Ower, \*Stephanie Nunn and Nic Dodin

**UKIP Group** Phil Martin

**Independent Residents Group** Graham Williamson

Councillors John Mylod, Jeffrey Tucker, David Durant and Michael Deon Burton were present for part of the meeting.

\*Councillor Stephanie Nunn was also present for part of the meeting.

50 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.

**84 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings held on 21 August and 4 September 2014 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**85 P0972.14 - 16 & 18 AND LAND TO THE REAR OF PROSPECT ROAD, HORNCHURCH**

The report before Members concerned an outline planning application to demolish numbers 16 and 18 Prospect Road to allow for the creation of a new access road and provision of nine new detached dwellings and two replacement dwellings.

Members noted that that the application had been called in by three Councillors.

Councillor Roger Ramsey requested that the application be called in to the Committee, on the grounds of its impact on neighbours and the streetscene.

Councillor Darren Wise requested that the application be called in to the Committee, as the previous proposal had issues regarding overcrowding and insufficient pedestrian access to the site via the access road and this required a more detailed review by the Committee.

Councillor Ron Ower requested that the application be called in to the Committee, due to the previous planning history for the site, the closeness to the Green Belt and possible traffic problems.

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 most distressing aspect of the application was the proposed demolition of numbers 16 and 18 Prospect Road and the impact this would have on the occupants of the adjacent properties, numbers 14 and 20 Prospect Road who were both elderly residents and in poor health. The objector also commented that the occupants of numbers 14 and 20 would be subjected to months of noise, disturbance and stress during the demolition and construction period and asked that the Committee refuse the application on these grounds.

In response the applicant's agent commented that the proposed development was the same design as application P1119.13 that had been narrowly dismissed on appeal; that the Planning Department were happy with the proposed scheme and recommended its approval. The agent also commented that he understood and appreciated the concerns of neighbouring residents, stating that many of these concerns were not planning issues but would be dealt with under the provisions of the Party Wall Act. The Agent stated that the proposed development would be in keeping with the streetscene and did not conflict with any of the Council's policies.

In their absences both Councillors Roger Ramsey and Darren Wise had submitted written representations that they wished the Committee to consider.

Councillor Ramsey's representation commented on the aspect of the application which was of most concern to neighbours and residents which was the impact on the elderly neighbours whose bungalows at 14 and 20 Prospect Road were attached to those that were to be demolished and the possible breach of the resident's Human Rights.

Councillor Wise's representation concentrated on the proposed access/egress arrangements for the proposed dwellings and the possibility of future flooding of the area due to the removal of existing vegetation.

During the debate Members discussed the limited reasons for the refusal of planning application P1119.13 by the Planning Inspectorate noting that the current application addressed the reason for refusal.

Members noted the level of opposition towards the proposed development.

Members agreed that whilst a refusal of the application would be difficult to support it was important to ensure that there was minimal disruption and inconvenience to the residents of numbers 14 and 20 Prospect Road through a methodology for the demolition and reconstruction of 16 and 18 Prospect Road and further planning conditions.

The report recommended that planning permission be approved, however following a motion to defer the granting of planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that consideration of the report be deferred to enable officers to consider and/or negotiate the following:

- the provision of details of full methodology for demolition and reconstruction of the 16 and 18 Prospect Road and for suitable planning conditions to be identified.
- a reduction to construction hours to 9am – 5pm maximum to provide some respite for the elderly attached neighbours.
- the demolition and reconstruction of 16 and 18 Prospect Road before commencement of any other part of the development and that a programme for this be secured
- any Human Rights Act implications

Members also noted that condition 32 of the report should have read "16 & 18" not "14 & 16" and would be amended accordingly.

86 **P0669.13 - LAND ADJACENT TO 330 ABBS CROSS LANE, HORNCHURCH**

The application before Members proposed the erection of a two storey block (not one storey as shown in the report) of flats providing four 1-bedroom units and two 2-bedroom units with associated parking.

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 scheme had been considered a number of times previously on each occasion being refused due to dangerous access/egress arrangements and the nature of local traffic conditions. The objector also commented about the lack of parking provision on the site

In response the applicant commented that the previous reasons for refusal had now been addressed and that the developers were in on-going discussions with the Council's Highways Department to address possible traffic concerns. The applicant also confirmed that the number of parking spaces included within the proposal met the Council's guidelines.

During a brief debate Members discussed the cramped nature of the proposal and lack of parking. Members also agreed that the local traffic conditions would adversely affect highway safety for both vehicles and pedestrians.

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 that:

- By reason of its access arrangement, proximity to the road bridge and the nature of local traffic conditions, the proposal would adversely affect highway safety, both vehicular and for pedestrians using the highway in the vicinity of the site entrance.
- There was insufficient on-site parking to meet the needs of future residents and their visitors.
- The overdevelopment arising from insufficient amenity space; the building's contrived setting towards the margins of the site, and the relationship with number 330 Abbs Cross Lane in which the new building would be overbearing and intrusive.

87     **P1070.14 - TESCO STORES LTD, BRIDGE ROAD RAINHAM -  
ERECTION OF DRY CLEANING, KEY CUTTING, SHOE AND WATCH  
REPAIRS POD TO RETAIL PREMISES**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the erection a key cutting, shoe and watch repairs and dry cleaning kiosk building at an existing retail premises.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Jeffrey Tucker on the grounds that the proposal appeared to be an over-development that would inflict significant harm to the vitality and viability of the Rainham village high street.

With its agreement Councillors Jeffrey Tucker and David Durant addressed the Committee.

Councillor Tucker commented that the proposal was an over-development of the site and offered Tesco a "back door" way of introducing new retail services that had not previously been agreed when the original planning permission for the superstore had been granted. Councillor Tucker also commented that although the car park of the retail site was of a spacious nature, the area that was proposed for the erection of the kiosk was

accessed by a narrow entrance road and situated adjacent to a pedestrian crossing.

Councillor Durant re-iterated the points raised by Councillor Tucker and also commented that the report described the site as being in Rainham Village when in fact it was situated outside of the village. Councillor Durant also commented that approving planning permission would be damaging to the vitality of the existing businesses located in the village.

During the debate Members discussed the siting of the kiosk noting that it was positioned too close to a pedestrian crossing undermining safety. Members commented on the design of the kiosk agreeing that its design was unattractive and harmful to visual amenity.

Members also raised concerns over the effect that the kiosk would have on existing businesses on Rainham Village high street. Members made a request of officers to consider whether the adverse impact of the kiosk on the retail provision and character within Rainham High Street could be raised as a reason for refusal. After consideration officers concluded that there was no policy basis for refusing the application on these grounds and as such the reason could not be supported.

Members discussed the steps that the Rainham Compass initiative had taken to re-vitalise the village area noting that the proposal could harm elements of the good work previously carried out.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission it was **RESOLVED** that:

- The building by reason of its utilitarian, basic design and appearance coupled with its position within the site would represent an obtrusive feature in the otherwise open character of this part of the site which would be harmful to the visual amenity.
- By reason of its position close to the pedestrian crossing and kerb, the building would adversely affect drivers' visibility of pedestrians and thereby be harmful to highway safety.

88     **A0042.14 - TESCO STORES LTD BRIDGE ROAD, RAINHAM -  
ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR FOUR STATICALLY ILLUMINATED  
SIGNS AND FIVE NON-ILLUMINATED SIGNS ON DRY CLEANING, KEY  
CUTTING, SHOE AND WATCH REPAIRS RETAIL POD**

The report had recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission the Committee **RESOLVED** that planning permission be refused on the grounds of duplication and excessive, cluttered signage harmful to visual amenity.

- 89     **P0033.14 - 205 RUSH GREEN ROAD, ROMFORD - EXTRACT DUCTING AND CHANGE OF USE FROM A1 TO A FLEXIBLE A1,A2,A3 & A5 USE WITH OPENING HOURS OF 11:00-23:00 EVERY DAY AND 12:00 - 22:30 ON BANK HOLIDAYS.**

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

- 90     **P0633.14 - UNIT 8 FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, MARSH WAY RAINHAM - REMOVAL OF SCAFFOLDING STORAGE & PORTAKABINS USED AS OFFICES AND ERECTION OF FIVE INDUSTRIAL UNITS FOR LETTING AS STORAGE/DISTRIBUTION UNITS**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and with a revision to condition seven substituting “non-motor vehicle residents” with “non-motor vehicle employees and visitors”.

- 91     **P0814.14 - PARK CORNER FARM, PARK FARM ROAD UPMINSTER**

The report before Members proposed an upgrade for two 600mm diameter transmission dishes to be mounted on a new support pole fixed to a tower extension leg. The new facility would provide additional sharing of the existing structure would require an extension in height from 25m to 28.5m above ground level.

During a brief debate members discussed the possible requirement for the tower to be fitted with a red aircraft warning light and whether the nearby airfield at Damyns Hall should be notified when the structure was in place. Officers confirmed that Civil Aviation Authority regulations covered the installation of aircraft warning lights and that this was not an issue for planning.

In reply to a question regarding sharing agreements for the tower’s services officers confirmed that they were unable to confirm the identity of the companies who would be using the facility.

It was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to include two additional informatives requesting that the applicant:

- Ensure they satisfy any Civil Aviation Authority requirement to have a red warning light at the top of the structure.
- To notify Damyns Hall aerodrome when the extended structure had been completed.

*During the discussion of item P0814.14 Councillor Michael White left the room and did not take part in voting on the item.*

92     **P0818.14 - 112-116 SOUTH STREET, ROMFORD**

The application before Members sought planning permission for the change of use of part of the ground floor and the four upper floors from a retail storage use (use class A3) to a hotel use (use class C1).

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Frederick Thompson on the grounds that the proposal was not in compliance with the aspects affecting heritage assets with respect to the front facade. Members were advised that Councillor Thompson had since withdrawn his objection to the proposal.

In accordance with the public participation arrangements, the Committee was addressed by an objector without a response by the applicant.

Speaking on behalf of the Civic Society the objector commented that having seen the new amendments to the plans relating to the window alterations to the facade of the building that he now wished to withdraw the objection and support the proposal.

During a brief debate Members agreed that the proposal would be a welcome addition to the town centre retaining the best features of the original building.

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

93     **P0907.14 - CRANHAM GOLF COURSE, ST MARY'S LANE UPMINSTER**

The planning application before Members proposed the installation of a solar energy farm at the site, generating approximately 2.6MW of electricity for the national grid created by 11,700 solar panels.

Members noted that the application had been called in by Councillor Ron Ower owing to the proposals potential harm to the green belt.

Members were advised that an additional condition was sought that stipulated that if the farm was not exporting electricity to the national grid within six months of completion then the solar panels were to be removed from the site.

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

The objector commented that there were concerns over the possible loss of Green Belt land and the amount of electricity that the farm would generate.

The objector questioned whether the land would be returned to open green belt after the life span of the solar farm.

In response the applicant's agent commented that development on Green Belt land could be permitted in special circumstances and that the land on which the proposed farm would be sited had not been used for agricultural purposes for a number of years and was low quality land. The agent stated that the land would be returned to open green belt after the life span of the solar farm.

During the debate Members discussed the possible problem with glare from the panels obstructing the view of drivers using the nearby M25. Officers confirmed that the Highways Agency had confirmed that the risk of glare was low.

Members discussed the value of preserving the land as open green belt, including the impact of the solar farm on local residents and the visual harm it would cause. Members questioned whether the granting of planning permission would set a precedent for development on other Green Belt land.

Members also sought clarification on the position of the infrastructure connected with the farm.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse the granting of planning permission which was carried by 8 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

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

- The principle harm to the Green Belt was not outweighed by very special circumstances.
- Physical harm to the Green Belt caused through the number and impact of the solar panel array together with the necessary infrastructure – fencing, lights and outbuildings all of which would have an unduly intrusive impact.
- Likely distraction to M25 drivers adversely affecting highway safety.

The vote for the resolution to refuse planning permission was carried by 8 votes to 1 with 2 abstentions.

Councillors Misir, Best, Crowder, White, Dodin, Hawthorn, Nunn and Williamson voted for the resolution to refuse the granting of planning permission.

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

Councillors White and Martin abstained from voting.



- 94 **P0989.14 - LAND TO THE WEST OF SANDGATE CLOSE ROMFORD - CHANGE OF USE TO PROVIDE A TEMPORARY CAR PARK FOR UP TO 290 SPACES TO SERVE QUEEN'S HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES, TOGETHER WITH REVISED ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE.**

The Committee considered the report and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and to include a requirement for on-site CCTV within the car park management condition (No.5).

*Councillor Stephanie Nunn was not present during the discussion of item P0989.14 and did not take part in the vote.*

- 95 **P1002.14 - 20 PINWOOD ROAD, HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER - CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 3 BEDROOM DWELLING (PREVIOUS APPROVED APPLICATION P1128.11).**

The Committee considered the report noting that the proposed development qualified for a Mayoral CIL payment of £2,050 and without debate **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

*Councillor Stephanie Nunn was not present during the discussion of item P1002.14 and did not take part in the vote.*

- 96 **P0986.14 - 104 PETERSFIELD ROAD, HAROLD HILL ROMFORD - CHANGE OF USE FROM A1 (RETAIL) TO A D2 (LEISURE) USE FOR A LADIES ONLY GYM AND SPA**

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

*Councillor Stephanie Nunn was not present during the discussion of item P0986.14 and did not take part in the vote.*

- 97 **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**