

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2021**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Maria Alexandrou, Daniel Anderson, Kate Anolue, Mahym Bedekova, Sinan Boztas, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, Doug Taylor, Hass Yusuf and Tim Leaver

**ABSENT** Susan Erbil

**OFFICERS:** Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Vincent Lacovara (Head of Planning), Catriona McFarlane (Legal Representative), Harriet Bell (Regeneration & Environment), Sarah Cary (Executive Director Place), Graham Harrington (Principal Planning Officer), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport Planner), Gilian Macinnes (Joint Head of Development Management), Helen Murch (Head of Strategic Planning and Design), Elizabeth Paraskeva (Principal Lawyer), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation) and Gideon Whittingham (Planning Decisions Manager) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Members of the public, applicant and agent representatives.

**1**

**WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED

1. Councillor Boztas (Chair) welcomed all attendees to the meeting. Committee members confirmed their presence.
2. Councillor Tim Leaver substituted for Councillor Susan Erbil.

**2**

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

NOTED

1. Councillor Hass Yusuf declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 – 20/04187 – Edmonton Green Shopping Centre, as he was involved in the Edmonton Travel Centre project.
2. Councillor Mahym Bedekova declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 – 20/04187 – Edmonton Green Shopping Centre, as she is a

leaseholder in a residential property 4 miles from Edmonton Green Shopping Centre (Sebastopol Road).

**3**

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING**

RECEIVED the report of the Head of Planning.

**4**

**21/03142/RE4 - REARDON COURT, 26 COSGROVE CLOSE, LONDON N21 3BH**

NOTED

1. The introduction by Gideon Whittingham, Interim Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
2. Changes were made to the following conditions:
  - Condition 13 – Boundary treatments to specify acoustic performance.
  - Condition 19 – Update to wording; requirements for Remediation Verification Strategy.
  - Condition 30 – Updated to state 80% of dwellings to meet Building Regulations M4 (2).

Additional conditions covering Secure by Design, NRMM, Ventilation details & Acoustic report.

3. Members debate and questions responded to by officers.
4. Members comments/queries as follows:
  - The scheme was a significant improvement on what was there before.
  - A much better use-age.
  - There would be a CIL contribution and was applicable. Relief would also be able to be applied for.
  - Clarification that boundary treatment alongside Barrowell Green would be a vegetative acoustic barrier for noise and appearance.
  - In terms of emergency access, tracking had been provided and a turning head. Officers were satisfied that emergency vehicles can access the site from different locations.
5. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that:

1. In accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed Granted subject to conditions.
2. That the Head of Development Management/Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the recommendation section of the report.

5

**21/03375/RE4 - GARAGES 1 TO 15, REAR OF 101-132 SNELL'S PARK ESTATE, SNELL'S PARK, LONDON, N18 2S**

NOTED

6. The introduction by Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
7. Additional conditions are recommended to require the glazing at upper floor level in the new commercial units facing the existing residential block to be obscure glazed and similarly that the windows to the upper deck of the double decker bus on the west side facing the existing residential be fitted with an obscure film.
  - a. That all glazing at first floor level in the west facing elevation of the new units shall be obscured with an equivalent obscuration as level 3 on the Pilkington Obscuration Range. The glazing shall not be altered without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining and neighbouring properties.
  - b. The windows to the upper level of the double decker bus to the west facing elevation shall be fitted with obscure film with an equivalent obscuration as level 3 on the Pilkington Obscuration Range prior to first use of the bus for the purposes hereby approved. The film shall not be removed or altered without the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority whilst the bus remains on site.  
Reason: To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of adjoining and neighbouring properties.
8. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that:

1. In accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed Granted subject to conditions.

6

**20/04187/OUT - EDMONTON GREEN SHOPPING CENTRE AND ADJOINING LAND (BOUNDED BY FORE STREET/THE BROADWAY, HERTFORD ROAD, MONMOUTH ROAD AND PLEVNA ROAD), ENFIELD, N9 0T**

9. The introduction by Graham Harrington, Principal Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals.
10. The deputation of Alex Lebel, local resident, speaking against the officers' recommendation.
11. The deputation of Vivienne Aiyela, local resident, speaking against the officers' recommendation.
12. Councillor Ergin Erbil made a statement as Edmonton Green Ward Councillor in support of the proposed development.

13. The response of Matt Mason, Sabri Marsoui and Mizad Khodsee, on behalf of the applicant.
14. Graham Harrington responded to questions raised by the deputations:
- Assurance by officers that objections to the scheme were thought through and have tried to address them. The dense nature of the scheme is detailed within the report. This was a design led approach to optimise the amount of development on the land and had been scrutinised by officers. The level of density was appropriate as a high-quality scheme and officers felt this is acceptable.
  - Surrounding parks e.g. Plevna Park would benefit from various sums of money from the recommended Heads of Terms.
  - The application did not include any basements for underground parking as they are deemed expensive to dig and is an extreme challenge to viability.
  - In terms of car parking for existing residents, officers are recommending an obligation of 156 leases which require that existing residents do have access to a car parking space.
  - In terms of the skyline, the developer does not control the existing 3 towers which L & Q and Metropolitan (Social Landlords) manage. The developers are bringing forward proposals around those retained towers.
  - In terms of additional facilities, obligations that officers are recommending are to secure the re-provision of a new library, community space and an additional space for a community cultural venue. Officers are ensuring that the existing facilities are put back in an improved state.
  - In terms of daylight/sunlight impact on homes, the report details in assessing daylight/sunlight impacts and overshadowing.
15. Members debate and questions responded to by officers.
16. Councillor Rye's concerns were around the potential loss of retail and if the loss would be replaced, the high density of the scheme pre-dominantly social housing which can lead to less successful communities in terms of health, educational aspirations achievements and ASB outcomes, the significant impact on the surrounding Conservation areas, the height of the development impacting on sunlight/daylight and overshadowing issues, loss of jobs as opposed to jobs created.
- Officers' advised that the application would result in a reduction of retail, as detailed within the report on page 230. Between 19% and 44% significant reduction in the amount of retail space. Some of that retail is at first floor level which is under used. On-line shopping increase, due to pandemic has accelerated the change in retail use. There would be a loss of retail space on the upper floors of 2,790sq metres. The loss of retail is between 7,865sq metres and 18,365sq metres. In terms of replacement retail, this would be a phased approach working with local retailers and giving opportunities to existing retailers to be part of the new Edmonton Green. In terms of the high rise and density, there has been a significant increase in the number tall buildings in the past 15 years. The policy has developed and is a product of planning policy and about optimising development. Officers think that the proposed density is acceptable in terms of housing

- quality, capacity of local infrastructure, capacity of green space and public transport availability. In terms of Conservation and 'less than substantial harm', there is a detailed assessment within the report. Officers had identified where there would be some harm to Conservation areas, listed and locally listed buildings within them. Planning policy allows Local Planning Authorities to weigh up that harm in the balance against the positive benefits that come with this scheme. In terms of daylight/sunlight impact, the lower floors of the retained towers, would be negatively impacted due to poor design in terms of daylight/sunlight. In terms of jobs, there will be a range of outcomes/uses which could result in an increase or decrease of jobs. Not known at this stage where it will sit in the spectrum.
17. In reply to Councillor Fallart's questions about replacement car parking and the culverting of Salmon's Brook, officers clarified that there would be surface car parking and a note on Asda's objection on parking had been circulated to members this evening and published alongside the update report and agenda on the web site. In terms of de-culverting Salmon's Brook, there had been much discussion about this with the developer and thoroughly explored options of de-culverting Salmon's Brook.
18. Members request regarding the housing mix of the development and if more 3-bedroom maisonettes could be built and more green spaces.
19. In reply to Councillor Yusuf's enquiry regarding the completion of the development if the latter phases (3 & 4) going ahead, officers clarified that planning permissions are permissive allowing developers to do things. Officers could not make a developer complete a scheme, there is a risk and so all the phases need to be acceptable. Developers are incentivised to complete this scheme if they are to make a profit.
20. In reply to Councillor Taylor's questions regarding the off-site play provision, heritage and if the cumulative impact outweighs the designation of the impact on specific heritage assets, proposition of a condition regarding the re-provision of community buildings, the public house, community centre and the library. These should be re-provided before demolition and the relationship with the developer and the 2 social landlords, L & Q & Metropolitan. Whether this relationship is significantly good to protect the interests of current residents going forward. Officers clarified that firstly, heritage assets are assessed on an individual basis and the harm to each. There will be an issue of cumulative harm with the conservation areas (Fore Street, Church street, The Crescent and Montagu Cemeteries) with some already recognised as fragile and are on the Historical England risk register. A distinction must be drawn between how individual harm is assessed and the potential heritage benefits from each of the assets. Officers identify where the harm is which goes from high for the conservation areas to low for other assets. There are concerns from Heritage officers and is why they have not been able to support the application particularly the materials and height of buildings and is something that can be conditioned materially. In terms of how to address this in the section 106 agreement, a lot of work is being done in terms of the heritage benefits and recognise the benefits that will bring. Play space is detailed at page 281 of the report. There would be a shortfall in play space but only for older aged children. The on-site play space is a priority for 4-year olds. The shortfall affects older range children who are

able to travel further. The immediate spaces are linked with the section 106 obligations for the improvement of Plevna Park and other green spaces. There is not an expectation that older children will need to travel long distances to access play space.

In terms of community facilities for re-provision, these will be provided as a temporary use for ground floor accommodation in another building. There are heads of terms in the section 106 agreement which officers had negotiated with the developer and property officers.

In terms of Metropolitan and L & Q, the social landlords and the retained towers, there is a relationship with Crosstree (the applicant) as there is a cladding issue. Crosstree are working with the social landlords about replacing cladding on nearby buildings (outside of the application site boundaries). There have also been meetings with the developer and social landlords to address objections.

21. Councillor Anderson raised concerns about the loss of car parking for ASDA, which may affect the viability of that business with a substantial loss of income. Further concerns included the following as detailed in the report:

- Point 9.129 – The Railway Tavern; the type of re-provision offered will be a very different type of service.
- Point 9.147 – Vacant office space in a poor state of repair being let at low rents. The low rents meet demands of business not having the means. If the development went forward, then the expected increased rents may not be met.
- Point 9.158 – Edmonton Green Library; additional costs for this especially as the library had been refurbished for £4.2M 4 years ago.
- Point 9.159 – Green Towers was only built in 2012/13 and talk of it now being demolished.
- Point 9.177 – Evergreen Health Centre; mention of 5 car parking spaces being provided and if that is sufficient/adequate. Not known what the existing parking provision is.
- Point 9.178 – Forest Road Primary Care Centre; CCG state that with re-development there could be more parking spaces. Not known the Primary Care Centre have commented if they are supportive and if this is viable.
- Point 9.191 – Affordable Housing; this has been based on habitable rooms but on actual units the figure is 31% and not 35%.
- Point 9.262 – Housing needs assessment; correction regarding the percentage for 3 bed houses. It is 42% at market rate and not 23.3%. The requirement for 3 bed houses in the borough is 42% and for 4 bed houses it is 29.6%. This scheme offers only 15% of affordable housing and should be 50%.

Officers clarified the following:

- Forest Road Primary Care Centre – unsure as to whether the Care Centre had been consulted. The CCG who have recommended this contribution would need to liaise with the practise themselves.
- Affordable housing – the figure is 31% by unit in phase 1 of the scheme. Planning policy uses habitable rooms as a basis of

calculating affordable housing so as to not disincentive the provision of family-sized homes.

- Dwelling mix – there is not a complete fit between the proposed mix of homes and the Council’s policy. Officers had encouraged family homes with the applicant and in particular those on the lower floors.
- Social rent and discounted market rent in phase 1 – there is a range of between 5-15% for family housing and officers would ensure that is skewed towards affordable homes and maximise the amount of affordable housing in each phase so that the dwelling mix meets housing need.
- London living rent – the report refers to a blended approach to 20% discount to market value, in line affordable housing policy which defines affordable housing as being up to 80% of market rents. There will be variations between different sized homes. The proposed head of terms has a definition of discounted market rents and the section 106 ties into a recognised definition of what discounted market rent is in this context.

22. The Head of Development Management summarised members concerned:

- The impact of conservation areas in terms of heritage.
- Open space and greening.
- Car parking.
- Re-provision of community buildings.
- Affordable housing.
- Viability of the scheme.
- Impact on living conditions in terms of daylight and sunlight.

Some of these issues raised are already covered in the section 106 agreement.

23. Officers felt that the issues raised are covered and set out in the report. Whilst there may be different ways of addressing these, officers believe that they have arrived at the optimum scheme which delivers the best options.

24. The support of the majority of the committee for the officers’ recommendation with 7 votes for and 5 against.

**AGREED** that:

1. That subject to the following details at i) ii) and iii) below the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions detailed at Section 3.4 of this report
  - i) The conclusion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the obligations detailed in the Heads of Terms referred to in the appendix to this report (as amended by the Update Report;and
  - ii) The application being referred to the Greater London Authority (GLA) as part of the Stage 2 referral and the inclusion of additions to S106 obligations or conditions requested by the GLA in their Stage 2 referral.

2. That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning / Head of Development Management to finalise conditions and the Section 106 Agreement in line with the summary conditions in Paragraph 3.4 and the Head of Terms in the appendix to this report;
3. That the Section 106 legal agreement referred to above be completed no later than 28/02/2022 or within such extended time as the Head of Planning/Head of Development Management shall agree in writing.

## 7

### **UPDATE REPORT - 20/04187/OUT - EDMONTON GREEN SHOPPING CENTRE AND ADJOINING LAND (BOUNDED BY FORE STREET/THE BROADWAY, HERTFORD ROAD, MONMOUTH ROAD AND PLEVNA ROAD), ENFIELD, N9 0T**

NOTED

1. An update report was circulated ahead of the meeting and tabled at the meeting.
2. Asda Car Parking Objection' was tabled at the meeting.

## 8

### **MEETING TIME EXTENSION**

NOTED

1. The committee would not reasonably be able to consider the remaining application on the agenda this evening due to the late hour, but was recommended to progress Agenda Item 6 (20/04187/OUT – Edmonton Green Shopping Centre & Adjoining Land).
2. The recommendation to extend the meeting and consider Items was supported unanimously by the committee.

**AGREED** that the rules of procedure within the Council's Constitution relating to the time meetings should end (10:00pm) be suspended for a period of 60 minutes to enable Item 6 to be considered.

## 9

### **FUTURE MEETING DATES**

Future meetings of the Planning Committee will be:

- 4 January 2022 – Provisional
- 18 January 22
- 3 February 2022 – Provisional
- 22 February 2022
- 8 March 2022 – Provisional
- 22 March 2022
- 5 April 2022 – Provisional
- 26 April 2022

