

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
1 August 2013 (7.30 - 9.15 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS: 11

Conservative Group Barry Oddy (in the Chair) Jeffrey Brace, Robby Misir, Becky Bennett, Steven Kelly, +Wendy Brice-Thompson and +Frederick Thompson

Residents' Group Linda Hawthorn and Ron Ower

Labour Group Paul McGeary

Independent Residents Group +Michael Deon Burton

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors Roger Evans, Mark Logan and Barry Tebbutt .

+Substitute members: Councillor Frederick Thompson (for Councillor Barry Tebbutt), Councillor Wendy Brice-Thompson (for Councillor Roger Evans) and Councillor Michael Deon Burton (for Councillor Mark Logan).

Councillors Sandra Binion, Georgina Galpin, Lesley Kelly, Barbara Matthews and Linda Van den Hende were also present for parts of the meeting.

29 members of the public were present.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against. There were no declarations of interests.

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

64 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 6 June 2013 was agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman

65 **P0206.13 - FISHING LAKE ADJACENT BRAMBLE FARM, UPMINSTER**

This item was deferred at the request of officers in order to enable the applicant to submit a revised site layout plan that reflected the title.

66 **P0258.13 - BEVERLEY BUNGALOW, NORTH ROAD, HAVERING-ATTE-BOWER**

This item was deferred at the request of officers in order to enable a check be undertaken on the accuracy of planning history referenced in the report in particular whether a similar proposal was refused approximately 10 years ago.

67 **P0592.13 - 22 LAMSON ROAD, RAINHAM**

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

68 **P0664.13- LAND TO THE REAR OF GARRICK HOUSE, ADELPHI CRESCENT, HORNCURCH**

The Committee considered the report that proposed to erect two single storey sheltered accommodation buildings comprising five two bedroom self-contained bungalows with associated amenity space and 3 car parking spaces. The proposed additional units would become part of the Garrick House complex. The development would provide dedicated amenity space to the east and west of the new buildings.

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

With its agreement Councillors Georgina Galpin, Lesley Kelly and Barbara Matthews addressed the Committee.

Councillor Galpin welcomed the new development and noted that it was at no cost to the council.

Councillor Matthews accepted that there was a need for such homes in the borough but raised concern why so many new homes were going on this site. She was of the view that the density was in excess of guidelines.

Councillor Lesley Kelly commented that such properties are being built where it was appropriate/feasible. She also stressed the need to look after the elderly in society.

During the debate a member sought clarification on the amount of parking spaces being lost to the new development. The Committee was informed that by merging the two applications for consideration, the parking level was exceeded on the site. A member raised concern on the loss of amenity spaces, loss of trees, loss of car parking space that related to inconvenience of car parking and light pollution.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission by Councillor Hawthorn seconded by Councillor Ower, which was lost by 8 votes to 2 and 1 abstention it was **RESOLVED** to approve as recommended subject to revision of Condition 19 (age restriction) to read "the dwellings hereby permitted shall only be occupied by persons of 55 years or older and the spouse or cohabiting partner of such person irrespective of age" plus additional condition requiring submission, agreement, implementation and maintenance of the approved scheme to prevent material levels of glare from headlights of cars using new parking spaces affecting amenity of existing ground floor units.

The resolution was approved with 8 votes in favour 2 against and with 1 abstention. Councillors Hawthorn and Ower Durant voted against the resolution to approve and Councillor McGeary abstained from voting.

69 **P0665.13- LAND TO THE REAR OF GARRICK HOUSE, ADELPHI CRESCENT, HORNCHURCH**

The report before the committee detailed proposed to erect two single storey extensions to create 4 self- contained sheltered housing flats with associated amenity space and the relocation of a right of way. Each flat would comprise of one or two bedrooms, a kitchen, bathroom and an open plan living and dining room.

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

With its agreement Councillors Georgina Galpin, Lesley Kelly and Barbara Matthews addressed the Committee reiterating the comments they made on the earlier application.

Councillor Galpin welcomed the new development and noted that it was at no cost to the council.

Councillor Matthews accepted that there was a need for such homes in the borough but raised concern why so many new homes were going on this site. She was of the view that the density was in excess of guidelines.

Councillor Lesley Kelly commented that such properties are being built where it was appropriate/feasible. She also stressed the need to look after the elderly in the society.

During the debate a member sought clarification on the amount of parking spaces being lost to the new development. The Committee was informed that by merging the two applications for consideration, the parking level was exceeded on the site. A member raised concern on the loss of amenity spaces, loss of trees, loss of car parking space that related to inconvenience of car parking and light pollution.

The report recommended that planning permission be granted, however following a motion to refuse planning permission by Councillor Ower seconded by Councillor Hawthorn, which was lost by 8 votes to 2 and 1 abstention it was **RESOLVED** to delegate approval to the Head of Regulatory Services provided no further representations are received before end of expiry period which raise new material considerations (in the event that new material consideration are received prior to the expiry of the consultation period the proposal be remitted back to Regulatory Services Committee for further consideration) and also subject to revision of Condition 17 (age restriction) to read "the dwellings hereby permitted shall only be occupied by persons of 55 years or older and the spouse or cohabiting partner of such person irrespective of age" plus additional condition requiring submission, agreement, implementation and maintenance of an approved scheme to prevent material levels of glare from headlights of cars using new parking spaces affecting amenity of existing ground floor units.

The resolution was approved by 9 votes in favour and 2 against, Councillors Hawthorn and Ower voted against the resolution to grant planning permission.

70 **P0457.13 - BOWER PARK SCHOOL, HAVERING ROAD, ROMFORD -
RETENTION OF GYMNASIUM**

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

71 **P1216.12 - 19 WALLENGER AVENUE, ROMFORD**

The application before the committee related to a detached house which was situated within the Gidea Park Special Character Area. It was proposed to construct a first floor side extension over the existing garage together with a front extension to the garage. The planning issues were set out in the report including issues relating to the design and appearance on the host dwelling, the impact on the character of the area and impact on amenity of surrounding residential properties.

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

expressed concern about loss of daylight and outlook to the flank windows of her property, summarised the history of the planning proposals in respect of the neighbouring dwelling and the judicial challenge which resulted in the grant of planning permission being quashed. The objector considered that the neighbouring property had been extended and was far larger than the original property. The applicant responded by referring to the results of the light survey and the design and scale of the extension being similar to a significant number of other extensions in the neighbourhood.

During the debate several members sought clarification on the loss of light from the window facing the development. Members were informed that a light survey had been submitted in support of the application. Staff suggested to Members that the survey conclusions appear to be based on the window being a secondary window whereas in fact it was originally a primary light source serving a dining room which has subsequently been integrated with other accommodation and made open plan. Staff reiterated points set out in the officer report and made clear that though the light survey concluded that there would be low impact on the affected area, the impact upon the dining room window would be noticeable and it was here that the judgement of Members was called for taking into account also that the kitchen/dining area benefitted from light access from other windows. Members were informed that the judgement of the impact on the neighbouring property was finely balanced, while there would be loss of light to the former primary window to the kitchen/dining room and some loss of outlook, that window was no longer the sole light source and the other windows providing daylight to the room were not significantly affected.

In regard to street scene and character issues, Officers explained that the eaves and the pitch heights of the extension as reduced made the extension appear subordinate to the house and not inappropriate or out of character with the surrounding area. Officers showed Members photographs of a number of examples nearby of other extensions and neighbouring dwellings with a relationship similar to that proposed. Officers concluded that the extension would not affect the spacing between the properties to such a degree that would material harm the streetscene.

A member commented that many houses in the area had benefited from similar extensions to their properties.

Other members stated that they were familiar with the area and that other surrounding premises that had similar extensions to those proposed in this application and considered it acceptable.

Following the debate it was **RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted.

The vote for the resolution was carried by 9 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions. Councillors McGeary and Thompson abstained from voting on the resolution.

72 **P0125.13 - 147, LONDON ROAD, ROMFORD**

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

Chairman