

Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
Council Chamber - Town Hall
23 April 2026 (7.01 - 7.37 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

Conservative Group Carol Smith

Havering Residents' Group Bryan Vincent (in the Chair) Robby Misir (Vice-Chair) and Gerry O'Sullivan (In place of Philippa Crowder)

Labour Matthew Stanton

There were 7 members of the public present, of whom 2 spoke on Item 7. Councillors N Patel and D Taylor also addressed the Committee on that item.

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

35 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Crowder with Councillor O'Sullivan attended as substitute.

36 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

37 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 12th February 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Committee.

38 APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION

The Committee noted the report.

39 **P1027.23 - 51 WINDERMERE AVENUE, HORNCHURCH**

The Committee considered an officer recommendation to defer the item to a later meeting. Following a brief discussion, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

40 **P1622.25 - 88 EASTERN ROAD, ROMFORD**

The Committee considered an application for a single-storey extension to an existing semi-detached dwelling, which would facilitate the use of the property as a 10-bedroom HMO. The proposals included an 18-metre rear extension, cycle storage at the rear of the garden and internal alterations as shown in the submitted plans.

The Committee noted that the site adjoins a children's centre to the south and forms part of a residential area characterised by similar dwellings.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements, the Committee was addressed by an objector. Concerns were raised regarding highway safety, with particular reference to poor visibility from the driveway and risks to road users. It was further stated that the development would adversely affect the safety of neighbouring properties and users of the adjacent children's centre. The speaker also alleged existing issues of anti-social behaviour at the property.

Councillor Patel addressed the Committee and expressed concern that the proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the area and conflicted with the Local Plan. It was suggested that the application represented an overdevelopment of the site and prioritised maximum occupancy rather than appropriate housing provision. Reference was made to increasing numbers of HMOs in the borough and the potential cumulative impact.

Councillor Taylor also spoke and noted that a previous application had been refused due to harm to residential amenity and that the revised submission did not sufficiently address those concerns. It was further stated that the proposal offered a poor standard of accommodation with limited parking provision, constrained layout and inadequate design. Concern was raised regarding the concentration of HMOs within the vicinity.

The Committee then received a second presentation outlining amendments made since the previous refusal. These included a reduction in parking spaces from ten to five, relocation of those spaces, an increase in communal space and the separation and relocation of bin and cycle storage. Officers advised that there were no in-principle objections and that, in their view, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity or highway safety.

During debate, Members raised concerns regarding traffic generation, safety and disturbance, particularly given the proximity to a children's centre and pedestrian crossing. It was noted that the reduction in on-site parking

could displace vehicles onto surrounding streets. Members also expressed concern regarding the scale and design of the extension, including its depth, which exceeded typical limits, and the adequacy of internal and external amenity space.

Additional concerns were raised regarding the quality of accommodation, the limited information provided and the potential safeguarding implications arising from the location adjacent to a children's centre. It was recognised that it may not constitute a material planning consideration.

In response, officers advised that a Planning Inspector had previously raised no objections in principle to the depth of the extension or parking arrangements. It was stated that the amended scheme sought to address earlier concerns and that appropriate conditions could be applied. Officers further advised that a balanced judgement had been reached with respect to potential impacts.

Following consideration, the officer recommendation for approval was **not agreed** unanimously, with 0 votes in favour, 5 against, and 0 abstentions.

A motion to refuse the application was **agreed** unanimously, with 5 votes in favour, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank