

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 7 JULY 2020**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Maria Alexandrou, Kate Anolue, Mahym Bedekova, Sinan Boztas, Elif Erbil, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven and Hass Yusuf

ABSENT Chris Bond and Dino Lemonides

OFFICERS: Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), David Gittens (Planning Decisions Manager), Claire Williams (Planning Decisions Manager), Dominic Millen (Group Leader Transportation) and John Hood (Legal Services) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillors Doug Taylor (Ponders End Ward), Ayfer Orhan (Ponders End Ward), Ian Barnes (Winchmore Hill Ward), Maria Alexandrou (Winchmore Hill Ward), Daniel Anderson (Southgate Green Ward), and Lindsay Rawlings (Town Ward)
Deputies: John Williams (Item 4), and Phil Ross (Item 8)
Applicant/Agent Representatives: Greg Blacquiere (Item 4), and Carolyn Apcar (Item 8)
Members of the public, applicant and agent representatives were able to observe the meeting live online.

**1
WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED

1. Councillor Boztas, incoming Planning Committee Chair, welcomed all attendees to the meeting, which was being broadcast live online. Committee members confirmed their presence and that they were able to hear and see the proceedings.
2. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bond and Lemonides.
3. Due to IT difficulties, Councillor Anolue was slightly late in joining the meeting.

**2
ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR**

NOTED Councillor Boztas' proposal seconded by Councillor Rye that Councillor Bedekova become Vice Chair of Planning Committee for the 2020-21 municipal year.

AGREED Councillor Bedekova was elected Vice Chair of the Planning Committee for the 2020-21 municipal year.

3

DECLARATION OF INTEREST

NOTED that Councillor Alexandrou would be making a deputation in respect of application ref 19/04345/RE4 – Tennis Courts, Broomfield Park, London 13, and would therefore take no part in the debate or vote on the application.

4

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING (REPORT NO.264)

RECEIVED the report of the Head of Planning.

5

19/03624/VAR - ALMA ESTATE, EN3

NOTED

1. Councillor Anolue missed the introduction, and was therefore unable to discuss and vote on the item.
2. The introduction by Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and highlighting the key issues and additional information provided since the previous deferral.
3. This application was reported to 21st April Planning Committee when Members deferred consideration largely because of concerns relating to the impact of the proposed development on the Phase 4 site on the amenities of adjoining residents.
4. Firstly, to refresh Members on the changes proposed through this application to the existing outline planning permission before focusing on the impacts of these changes on the amenities of adjoining residents.
5. Outline planning permission was granted in 2017 for the redevelopment of the site to provide 993 homes in blocks ranging in height between 2 and 16 storeys. The development was to be taken forward on phased basis. An outline planning permission sets the parameters within which the development can come forward identifying and key things like build zones, access routes, landscape strategy, the quantum and mix of development etc. It does not fix the detailed design and appearance of buildings.
6. When the outline planning permission was granted, the Borough's housing target was moving from 560-798 units per year. The 2019 Intend to Publish London Plan is suggesting a housing target of 1250 units/year. It is in the context of a significant increase in housing demand that schemes are being reviewed to ensure all sites are optimised.
7. This application seeks to vary the parameters of the outline planning permission. The details of the proposed changes are set out on pages 11 and 12 of the report. Essentially, the proposal is to increase the number of dwellings proposed from 993 to 1086 and in so doing amend the building height parameters of development with Phases 2A and 4.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

8. Following deferral of the application, the applicant has not amended the scheme but has provided additional information to demonstrate the impact of the development now proposed on the amenities of adjoining residents in comparison with the development already consented through the 2017 outline planning permission.
9. It is recognised that, as with any development, there will be an impact. This impact needs to be balanced against the benefits arising from the scheme. It is Officers view that the impact of the development now proposed has been minimised and this this limited additional impact is outweighed by the benefits that the scheme will deliver in terms of increased housing units , the bringing forward of affordable housing delivery and an overall improvement to the quality of the local environment and public realm.
10. The deputation of John Williams (neighbouring resident) speaking against the officers' recommendation.
11. The statement of Councillor Doug Taylor, Ponders End Ward Councillor.
12. The statement of Councillor Ayfer Orhan, Ponders End Ward Councillor.
13. The response of Greg Blaquiere, Terence O'Rourke (Agent).
14. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers.
15. Members' concerns in relation to bulk and massing, relationship to the surrounding area, intensification, and relationship with public space.
16. The Committee did not support the officers' recommendation: 5 votes against and 2 abstentions. Councillor Hasan was unable to be contacted at the time of voting.
17. Councillor Yusuf's proposal, seconded by Councillor Rye, that a decision on the application be deferred for the reasons discussed.
18. The unanimous support of the Committee for the application to be deferred.

AGREED that the application be deferred.

6

19/03834/RM - ALMA ESTATE, EN3

NOTED that further to the decision to defer the application above, this item was not considered and therefore no presentation was given.

AGREED that this item be deferred.

7

19/04345/RE4 - TENNIS COURTS, BROOMFIELD PARK, BROOMFIELD LANE, LONDON N13 4HE

NOTED

1. Councillor Alexandrou withdrew from the Committee for this item.
2. Councillors Anolue and Hasan were present from this point of the meeting.
3. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and highlighting the additional information in the addendum report.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

4. The application site is located to the south of Alderman's Hill. It falls within Broomfield Park which is a Grade II registered park, and consists of 9 sports courts. The site is also identified as local open space, metropolitan open land, and a site of archaeological interest.
5. Planning permission is sought by the Council, for the refurbishment of 9 Sports courts, involving resurfacing and partial reconstruction of the courts, installation of low level footpath bollard lighting from the entrance at Alderman's Hill to the courts, and installation of floodlighting.
6. The application was brought to Planning Committee on 21st May 2020. The application was deferred by Members to obtain more information regarding existing and projected usage of the courts, to demonstrate the need for the floodlighting on Metropolitan Open Land and within the historic park and the benefits of the proposal to the local community, and this additional information is clearly set out in the addendum report.
7. With regard to the usage of the courts by local schools, there are a number of local schools within the borough such as West Lea School (N9) and Grange Park Prep School (N21) that use the courts as well as others schools that fall outside of the borough, which raises no planning concerns.
8. The need for the improvements to the existing courts and proposed floodlights is clear and justified. The proposal would assist with increasing the participation of people playing netball and tennis in the Borough and meeting the Councils strategy and objectives for the sports courts at Broomfield Park and the wider community.
9. Receipt of 443 representations in support of the application from residents, the wider netball community, and local councillors: many addressed to Bambos Charalambous MP, and a petition received today.

In summary, matters raised include:

- Immediate and positive impact for maintaining netball in the park
 - Improved facilities including the provision of floodlights would increase the uptake in the usage of the courts for both tennis and netball for people across all age groups, abilities and ethnic backgrounds.
 - Provides income for the community café and other local businesses.
 - Without the floodlights and the refurbishment of the netball courts there would be a real danger that netball will no longer be played in the park and the viability of the North London Netball League.
 - There are football pitches, rugby pitches, tennis courts, basketball courts and skateboarding facilities in many parks around the Enfield area, but these are the only netball facilities in the borough. They are a central part of the netball community in Enfield and north London.
 - Important for health and well-being and social cohesion.
10. The courts have been identified as requiring significant improvement. The proposal will include resurfacing the sports courts for netball and tennis use in line with Sports England's requirements.
 11. As discussed at the May 2020 planning committee, it is recognised that the proposed floodlights due to their number and height, would be visible. Alternative floodlights in the form of retractable, demountable and strip

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

floodlights have been considered. However, they have been dismissed because retractable floodlights would result in excessive costs to the council, in terms of the installation of the retractable columns and their management, demountable columns would result in excessive costs and management and safety issues of manually having to retract the demountable floodlights on a daily basis, and the strip lighting option would not meet Sport England's requirements in terms of recommended uniform illumination levels. Consideration was also given to fixed floodlight columns at a height of 6 and 10 metres, however it is considered that the 8 metre floodlights are the most viable option in terms of design, Sports England guidance and the management and operation of the courts.

12. The Council will receive grant funding for a total of £100,000 from Sport England's Community Asset Fund, to go towards the redevelopment of the sports courts. However, this is subject to terms and conditions, including obtaining planning permission and ensuring the facility is adequately floodlit.
13. On balance, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to less than substantial harm to the heritage value of Broomfield Park, and any perceived adverse effects would be offset by the public benefits provided by the improvements and increased accessibility of the courts, and is therefore considered acceptable.
14. The proposal would be appropriate development in Metropolitan Open Land as it would support outdoor sport activities. The floodlights are reasonable and necessary to support use of the sports courts and would not detract from the openness of the site. In addition, due to the nature and scale of the proposal with no significant digging below ground level there will be no archaeological impact.
15. There would be no undue impact on neighbouring residential amenity, traffic and transportation, trees or drainage.
16. The proposal would provide improved community facilities and support the health and wellbeing of the local community.
17. The statement of Councillor Ian Barnes, Winchmore Hill Ward Councillor and Deputy Leader of the Council with a portfolio including sport, in support of the officers' recommendation.
18. The statement of Councillor Maria Alexandrou, Winchmore Hill Ward Councillor, in support of the officers' recommendation.
19. The statement of Councillor Daniel Anderson, Southgate Green Ward Councillor, in support of the officers' recommendation.
20. Councillor Rye welcomed the provision of all the information requested by the Committee and would be pleased to support the recommendation.
21. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

8

20/01134/RE4 - DOVER HOUSE SURGERY, 28 BOLTON ROAD, LONDON, N18 1HR

NOTED

1. Councillor Alexandrou re-joined the meeting.
2. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
3. Planning permission is sought for the conversion of the vacant doctors surgery (D1 use class) into 1 self contained flat, with wheelchair access, involving the replacement of the existing doors and windows, together with associated landscaping.
4. An application of this scale and nature would normally be determined under delegated authority, however the application is being reported to the Planning Committee because the application site, including the whole of Dover House, is Council owned.
5. The application site consists of a vacant GP surgery on the ground floor of a 14 storey block of flats, located on the northern side of Bolton Road.
6. The surgery has been vacant since October 2018. The surgery closed because it merged with the Angel Surgery on Fore Street, which is located approximately 0.4 miles from the site. A suitable replacement facility was found to cater for the local community that maintains the same level of public provision and accessibility which is in accordance with policy requirements.
7. The proposal would provide an additional 3 bed family wheelchair accessible unit. The residential unit will form part of Enfield Council's social housing provision and will be allocated to an applicant on the Council's register with particular accessibility needs.
8. The proposals would not have any detrimental impact on visual and residential amenity, or the highway network.
9. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Head of Development Management / the Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

9

20/01084/FUL - 36 HOLTWHITES HILL, ENFIELD, EN2 0RX

NOTED

1. The introduction by David Gittens, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and the site's planning history.
2. This application relates to a planning proposal for: Two storey side and rear extension including roof extension and two front and three rear dormers, and relocation of front bay windows to existing House in Multiple Occupation to increase the accommodation from nine rooms with shared facilities plus one self-contained one bedroom flat to twenty one rooms over three floors with shared facilities at no 36 Holwhites Hill.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

3. The proposal is to increase the quantity of accommodation. Currently the site provides accommodation for up to 20 residents. Proposal is to extend to provide accommodation for up to 37 residents
4. The facts in this case relate back to a decision of a Council to refuse planning permission for bulkier but relatively similar scheme at the site submitted in 2015 for:
 - Two storey side extension, two storey rear extension and roof extension to existing House in Multiple Occupation to increase the accommodation from nine rooms with shared facilities plus one self-contained one bedroom flat to twenty one rooms over three floors with shared facilitiesPlanning permission was refused by the Council for:
 - ii) resulting in an over-intensive HMO use of the site.
 - ii) The overall size, bulk in particular in respect of the roof design would appear overly dominant, visually intrusive and out of keeping in the street scene.
 - iii) Over intensive use and density of development proposed, that would result in a level of activity, noise and general disturbance which will have detrimental impact on amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.
 - iv) The proposed development fails to demonstrate adequate and safe access arrangements, adequate levels of parking provision, servicing and cycle parking arrangements commensurate with the more intensive use proposed, leading to an unacceptable parking demand on the local highway network and conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic.The applicants appealed against the Council's decision.
5. Whilst the appeal was dismissed the Planning Inspector made it clear that they did not uphold the Council's arguments in respect of:
 - i) PP was refused by the Council for being an over intensive overdevelopment of the site
 - ii) Over intensive use of the site for HMO purposes
 - iii) Poor access arrangements in relation to highways safety
6. However, the Inspector did uphold the Council's concern in respect of the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, in particular, concerns with regard to the scale and bulk of the roof design.
7. In 2017 a further planning application was made which sought to respond to the concerns that were raised by the Planning Inspector in respect of the roof design. This scheme was granted planning permission. This scheme is very similar to the scheme presently before Members. However, that permission has now expired, and the applicants are now seeking permission again.
8. So, in relation to the issues upon which we went to appeal from the 2015 scheme, the Inspector dismissed all the Council's concerns except those that related to the roof design, its scale, bulk and prominence in the street scene. In 2017 the roof design issues were resolved and planning permission was granted for a scheme that is very similar to the one before Members tonight but has now expired.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

9. In response to the concerns about the adequacy of consultation, a plan was shown which indicated all of the addresses that were directly notified of the proposed development by letter.
This amounted to 28 addresses, which is identical to the no of addresses notified of the 2017 application and one more address than notified in respect of the 2015 application.
The level of notification far exceeds the minimum standards required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended) and confirms that the Council has not under-consulted.
10. Some late correspondence had been received in respect of this application since the agenda was compiled, from a number of residences underlining the objections already stated in the report including from the following addresses:
Holtwhites Hill - 11, 16, 17, 35, 41, 49, 59
11. The deputation of Phil Ross, representing neighbouring residents.
12. The statement of Councillor Lindsay Rawlings, Town Ward Councillor, on behalf of local residents opposed to the proposal.
13. The response of Carolyn Apcar, Apcar Smith Planning (Agent).
14. The Committee agreed to a short extension of the meeting beyond 10pm.
15. Members' debate, and questions responded to by the officers.
Discussion amongst Members suggested that:
 - There was concern about the intensification of the use/parking problems/noise and disturbance .
 - More information about the proposal was required
 - New management was required for the building and maybe a condition to secure a management plan
 - Wider consultation with local residents should be considered
16. The majority of the Committee did not support the officers' recommendation: 1 vote for, 6 votes against, and 2 abstentions.
17. The proposal by Councillor Yusuf seconded by Councillor Rye and supported unanimously by the Committee that a decision on the application be deferred in respect of issues around noise and disturbance and the management of the HMO property – to be explored further with the Agent.

AGREED that the application be deferred.

Reason: potential impact of noise / disturbance on residential amenity and the need for a management plan

10 FUTURE MEETING DATES

NOTED

1. Members agreed to making a site visit to two sites on Waggon Road where applications were due to be brought back to Committee.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 7.7.2020

2. Members were invited to briefing sessions on two forthcoming major applications, to be provided virtually.
3. The next meeting dates for the Committee would be 21 July, 4 August, 1 September and 22 September. An additional meeting may also be required in the last week of September.