

Public Document Pack

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford
25 June 2026 (7.00 - 7.50 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS:

Reform Group Gary Payne, Sathya Maddassani (Vice-Chair),
Russell Smith and + Iurie Bivol

**Havering Aligned
Residents' Association
Group** Michael Fisher

Councillor Russell Smith and Councillor Trevor McKeever were also present for parts of the meeting.

6 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.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology was received for the absence of Councillor Geoff Burgess. Councillor Burgess was substituted by + Councillor Iurie Bivol.

2 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interests.

3 MINUTES

The Committee, having received guidance from Officers, agreed to note the minutes as an accurate record of the decisions made and matters considered at the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 April 2026 and signed by the Chairman.

4 **P1405.25 - 14 CHRISTCHURCH AVENUE, RM13 8JB (BEAM PARK WARD)**

The Committee considered a report that sought permission for the reconstruction of the two-storey side extension to incorporate a set back at first floor and have a hipped roof.

The proposed side extension would be 2.6m wide, with matching eaves to the main house. The first floor would be set back from the front façade by 1.4m, incorporating a pitched roof pitched over the ground floor projection. The roof would be set down from the ridge to the main roof and hipped to match the existing dwelling.

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 Trevor McKeever addressed the Committee stating the following objections.

Councillor McKeever reiterated concerns regarding the proposal's bulk, scale and relationship with the street scene, noting that previous applications had been refused on the grounds that the extension was considered excessive, failed to remain subordinate to the host dwelling and eroded the characteristic spacing between properties.

He also stated that the key consideration for Members was what material changes had been made since those refusals. The objector acknowledged that the report concluded that the revised design had overcome the previously identified harm but submitted that the plans indicated alterations to the existing structure rather than a fundamental redesign.

Councillor McKeever concluded by reminding the Committee that although the application was retrospective, it should be determined solely on its planning merits and not influenced by the fact that the development had already been carried out or by the consequences of requiring its alteration or removal. Members were asked to consider whether the revised proposal had genuinely overcome the planning harm.

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

Miss Carol Baker addressed the Committee in objection to the application. She stated that the proposal should not be considered in isolation as the extension had already been constructed without planning permission, had been refused planning permission on more than one occasion and was subject to an enforcement notice requiring demolition to ground floor level. She considered these to be material planning considerations.

Miss Baker referred to the officer's conclusion that the proposal had overcome the reasons for previous refusals through amendments including a first-floor setback, a hipped roof and a reduced ridge height. However, she contended that the report did not adequately explain how these changes overcame the planning harm previously identified. She maintained that, despite the amendments, the proposal remained a substantial two-storey side extension on a prominent corner plot and questioned whether Members were satisfied that the previous planning harm had genuinely been addressed.

Mr Riaz Patel - Agent, on behalf of Mr and Mrs Ali, addressed the Committee in support of the application. He provided background information regarding the applicants, he advised that, in January 2021, Mr Ali suffered a severe stroke which left him with complex disabilities and permanently reliant on a wheelchair.

Mr Patel informed the Committee that supporting evidence had been submitted from medical professionals, support workers and Havering Council's Local Area Coordinator outlining Mr Ali's condition and the importance of the extension to the family's wellbeing. He explained that Mrs Ali had given up work to care for her husband and that the family had been required to relocate from their previous home which was unsuitable for wheelchair use due to its layout across several floors.

The Committee heard that the Christchurch Avenue property offered the opportunity to provide suitable accommodation for Mr Ali's needs including a ground-floor bedroom, level access and wheelchair-accessible facilities.

The Principal Planning Officer responded to points raised by the objector and Members, advising the Committee that whilst the existing extension, previous planning decisions and the extant enforcement notice formed part of the planning history and provided context for the assessment, Members were required to consider the proposed reconstruction as presented and to determine whether it complied with the Council's design guidance and relevant planning policies. It was explained that enforcement matters remained separate from the determination of the planning application and could continue to be pursued independently if necessary. Members' attention was drawn to the informative contained within the committee report regarding enforcement action.

The officer then summarised the material planning considerations set out in the report, namely the impact on design, character and the street scene, neighbouring amenity, highways and parking considerations and equality matters. In respect of design and appearance, Members were advised that the proposal had been assessed against the Council's design guidance, taking account of previous decisions, and officers were satisfied that the amended design was acceptable. Attention was drawn to the detailed assessment contained within paragraph 9.2 of the report and to the recommended condition requiring the submission and approval of external materials to ensure a close visual match with the existing dwelling.

Regarding neighbouring amenity, the officer explained that the adjoining property was set away from the application site and that the proposed extension, as redesigned, would not project beyond the established building line so as to result in unacceptable impacts. Officers had therefore concluded that the proposal would not give rise to material harm to neighbouring occupiers. Reference was made to the detailed assessment contained within paragraphs 9.6 to 9.9 of the report.

In relation to highways and parking matters, Members were advised that the two-storey extension would not result in an unacceptable reduction in parking provision or give rise to adverse highway impacts. Officers were satisfied that the proposal complied with the relevant parking and highway standards.

The officer also highlighted the equality considerations set out in paragraph 9.11 of the report. Significant weight had been given to the circumstances of the applicant, who had impaired mobility, and to the Council's duties under the Equality Act 2010. Having considered these matters, officers concluded that the recommendation to grant planning permission would not conflict with the Council's obligations under the legislation.

The officer concluded by advising that, having regard to all material planning considerations, the recommendation before Members was that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the committee report. Officers considered that these measures were sufficiently robust to address the planning issues identified.

Following discussion and consideration the Committee Resolved to Grant planning permission subject to conditions in the report.

The Committee voted unanimously in favour of officer recommendation.

5 P0328.26 - 92 GROSVENOR DRIVE HORNBURCH (HYLANDS & HARROW LODGE WARD)

The Committee considered an application for planning permission for the erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension.

The report detailed that planning consent is sought for a part single, part two storey rear extension. The ground floor element of the extension has a staggered depth. On the boundary with the attached neighbour it is 4.6m in depth; on the boundary with the unattached neighbour it extends to a depth of 3.1m, before chamfering away from the boundary to an overall depth of 6m. The ground floor extension has a flat roof and the height varies from 3m above ground level at the back of the house to 2.8m measured at garden level.

The proposal also includes a first floor rear extension, which is 3m deep and set in 2m from both side boundaries of the site. The extension is finished with a pitched hipped roof.

Members were shown an aerial photograph of the application site and the surrounding area, which was characterised by a mix of single-storey and two-storey dwellings of varying styles and designs. The aerial image identified the application property and the location of a first-floor rear extension at No. 5 Windsor Road. Photographs were also presented showing the side elevation of No. 94 Grosvenor Drive and the area surrounding the proposed extension.

Further photographs were provided from the first-floor level of No. 90 Grosvenor Drive, the adjoining neighbour, illustrating views towards the application site. Additional images showed views from the neighbouring first-floor window overlooking the application property, together with photographs taken from the living room and patio area of No. 90, looking towards the site. Members were also shown further views from the neighbouring patio area to provide context regarding the relationship between the properties.

The Officer presented the proposed floor plans for the ground-floor and first-floor rear extensions. It was explained that the proposed extensions complied with the relevant planning policies and guidance. Referring to the ground-floor plan, the Officer advised that while policy guidance for semi-detached properties generally permitted a rear extension of up to four metres in depth, the proposed extension would extend to 4.6 metres. However, the Officer noted that the proposal remained within the notional line drawn from the four-metre point on the boundary and was therefore considered policy compliant.

In relation to the first-floor rear extension, Members were advised that the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) required such extensions to be set in a minimum of two metres from either boundary and to project no more than three metres beyond the rear wall of the dwelling. The proposed extension would be set approximately 2.45 metres from the boundary with No. 90, thereby exceeding the minimum requirement. Although a 45-degree notional line had been illustrated in the plans, the Officer explained that this was a rule of thumb rather than a formal requirement of the Council's guidance. The proposal was therefore assessed primarily against the SPD requirements relating to boundary separation and projection depth.

The Officer concluded that, subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character of the surrounding area or on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Appropriate safeguarding conditions were proposed to protect adjoining residents.

Following discussion and consideration the Committee Resolved to Grant planning permission subject to conditions in the report.

The Committee voted unanimously in favour of officer recommendation.

6 P0405.26 - GREENWAY COURT, ESTATE OFFICE, BUTTS GREEN ROAD HORNCHURCH (EMERSON PARK WARD)

The application before the Committee sought variation of condition No. 2 for (approved plans) of planning permission ref: P0353.24 dated 7/ June 2024 to allow for alterations to the access (Change of use of Estate Office B1 use to a single residential social rental apartment including conversion of the estate office).

The report stated that the item was brought before the committee as the application related to a serving Councillor.

The proposals would replace an existing high-level window with one that matches those elsewhere on the building and would create a new opening adjacent to the front elevation for access to the residential unit. The proposals would effectively increase the size of the flat by utilising some of the communal area whilst also providing it with its own dedicated access rather than the communal arrangement originally approved.

The Planning Officer outlined the material planning considerations relevant to the application. These included the principle of development, design and impact on the street scene, the quality of the living environment, the impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and any highways and parking considerations. The Officer advised that there were no material planning reasons to withhold permission. Members were reminded that the application sought to vary an existing planning permission that was capable of implementation.

The proposal would improve the residential unit and provide tangible benefits for future occupiers, while not resulting in any material harm to the amenity of existing residents. The Officer further advised that there were no objections on highways, parking, design or visual grounds, noting that the development would be set well back from the public realm. Members were therefore asked to support the officer recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the committee report.

During the general debate, a Member asked for clarification regarding the communal area that would be lost as a result of the proposal and what it was currently used for. In response, the Officer referred Members to the plans and explained that the area in question formed part of a communal space within the building. The Officer advised that the space was effectively unused and did not provide any meaningful benefit to existing residents, describing it as a "dead space". Referring to the proposed layout, the Officer

explained that the area would remain part of the circulation space but that its loss would not adversely affect residents.

Further clarification was provided that the space functioned primarily as circulation space within the building rather than usable amenity space. It was not an area capable of being used meaningfully by residents but rather facilitated movement between different parts of the building. Officers therefore considered that the loss of the space would not give rise to any concerns, whereas the creation of a larger residential unit would deliver a clear benefit for future occupiers and represent a more effective use of the building.

Following discussion and consideration the Committee Resolved to Grant planning permission subject to conditions in the report.

The Committee voted unanimously in favour of officer recommendation.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank