

Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber - Town Hall
18 April 2024 (7.30 - 9.00 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group

Havering Residents' Group Bryan Vincent (in the Chair) Reg Whitney (Vice-Chair) and Gerry O'Sullivan

Labour Matthew Stanton

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Philippa Crowder, Carol Smith and John Crowder.

11 members of the public were present.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors and John Crowder.

16 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

17 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2024 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the chairman.

18 P1413.23 - LAND ADJACENT TO 7 FERNDOWN, HORNCHURCH

The report before Members detailed an application that sought planning permission for the erection of a 1 x two storey, 2-bed, detached dwelling with two car parking spaces and associated works.

The report stated that following concerns that were raised, it was suggested that the car parking layout be revised so as for the number of spaces proposed within the site to be reduced to one and to also replace the soft landscaping proposed directly to the front of the dwelling with hardstanding in order to provide more space for vehicles to manoeuvre within the site.

There were also concerns raised about the amenity impacts of the proposed developments on no. 9 Ferndown, particularly in relation to loss of day and sunlight as the scheme originally proposed a gabled roof. It was noted that the applicant was advised to revise the scheme to feature a hipped roof instead. The report stated that applicant's agent agreed to both amendments.

In officers view the proposed dwelling would be acceptable from a design standpoint and would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding street scene. The report asked that the Committee grant planning permission subject to suggested planning conditions.

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

A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee consideration criteria.

The application had been called-in by a Ward Councillor. With its agreement Councillor Laurence Garrard addressed the Committee. In response to the issues raised by Councillor Garrard, it was clarified that a covenant was not a material planning consideration but was covered under other legal entity in its own respect and covered under other legislation. Members sought clarification if the application was in keeping with the Emerson Park planning restrictions. Officers confirmed that this was a matter for the judgement of the Committee but that, in Officer's opinion, the application was policy compliant.

Members had concern about the length of the drive way that 3 residents will have to share if this application was passed.

Other issues raised by members related to the drainage of excess water from the drive way and the suitability of the driveway to deal with surface water run off Officers clarified that a planning condition was proposed which was considered adequate to deal with this matter.

The condition that members were concerned about and that was subsequently discussed related to the material for hardstanding proposed within the site

Following consideration, it was resolved not to grant planning permission. The vote for the resolution not to grant planning permission was 2 in favour and 2 votes against. Councillors Whitney and Vincent voted in favour while Councillors O'Sullivan and Stanton voted against.

The application not to grant planning permission was decided on the Chairman's casting vote.

The Committee debated aspect for refusal of the application in order to move a substantive motion.

Member discussed the following issues:

- The shared nature of the dropped kerb and access road.
- The relationship that the shared nature would create.
- The character of the proposal and how it will integrate to the streetscene
- That the access is congested and not suitable for 2 cars, parking issues. Safety of getting on and off the drive especially in winter. Large development in relationship to No 7 & no 9 properties.
- Will change the way these resident feel about their property
- Is out of keeping with policy
- Emerson Park policy area SPD in particular the close relationship and close proximity of the property relative to its neighbours and makes it out of keeping with the Emerson Park policy.

Councillor Stanton raised a substantive refusal motion which was seconded by Councillor O'Sullivan.

The vote to refuse planning permission was carried by 3 votes to 1 against. Councillors Whitney, O'Sullivan and Stanton voted in favour while Councillor Vincent voted against.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank