

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

HELD ON TUESDAY, 26TH APRIL, 2022

MEMBERS: Councillors Maria Alexandrou, Daniel Anderson, Kate Anolue, Susan Erbil, Peter Fallart, Ahmet Hasan (Associate Cabinet Member (Enfield North)), Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, Doug Taylor and Hass Yusuf

Officers: Vincent Lacovara (Head of Planning), Amena Matin (Housing Development and Estate Regeneration Programme Manager), David B Taylor (Head of Traffic and Transportation), Andy Higham (Joint Head of Development Management), Gilian Macinnes (Joint Head of Development Management), David Gittens (Planning Decisions Manager), Gideon Whittingham (Planning Decisions Manager), Lap-Pan Chong (Principal Planning Officer), James Clark (Principal Planning Officer), Elizabeth Paraskeva (Principal Lawyer), Catriona McFarlane (Legal Representative), Tony Medall (Operations Manager - Homeless Hub Project), Tom Rumble (Urban Design Lead & Deputy Team Manager), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport Planner), Marie Lowe (Governance and Scrutiny Officer) and Robyn McIntock (Governance Officer)

Also Attending: Councillor Gina Needs (Cabinet Member for Social Housing), Members of the public, deputies, applicant and agent representatives.

1 **WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Boztas (Chair) apologised for arriving late at the meeting. He had been unavoidably detained by a family emergency. He then welcomed all attendees to the meeting and confirmed the meeting procedures.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bedekova.

2 **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Doug Taylor declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 - 22/00004/RE4 - Carpark, 291 High Street, EN3 4DN, and stated that, following careful consideration of the advice he had received from the Interim Director of Law and Governance, he would not participate in this item at all.

3 **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON: 23 November 2021; 7 December 2021; 4 January 2022; 18 January 2022; 3 February 2022; 22 February 2022; 8 March 2022; 29 March 2022**

AGREED that:

1. Subject to the amendment of the minutes of 23 November 2021 to note that Councillor Peter Fallart was in attendance;

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

2. The dissatisfaction of the Members regarding the delay and the view that the shorter minutes did not fully reflect the discussion which had taken place at the meetings be noted;
3. A joint strategy between all services was being developed to provide fuller but not verbatim minutes, was welcomed and noted; and
4. On being put to individual votes, the minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on: 23 November 2021; 7 December 2021; 4 January 2022; 18 January 2022; 3 February 2022; 22 February 2022; 8 March 2022; 29 March 2022 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

4 **REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING**

NOTED the report of the Head of Planning.

5 **20/03530/FUL - Land End, 18 And Bush Hill Cottage, 20 Bush Hill, London, N21 2BX**

The introduction by James Clarke, Principal Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals and updates following the publication of the agenda.

It was confirmed that additional conditions would be included to cover:

- Yellow lines/ TMO on Bush Hill (subject to legal agreement and s278)
- Cycle Storage (sitting/appearance)
- Ramp access to Block B
- Privacy screens to ground floor units

The statement of Councillor Andy Milne, Grange Ward Councillor, spoke against the officers' recommendation.

The response of Michael Calder, the agent on behalf of the applicant.

Members, during the debate, raised concerns in relation to the feasibility, ease and likelihood that future residents would be able to increase the properties from two to three bedrooms; the loss of trees; the design and character of the proposed development, which some considered to be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring properties; the lack of provision of a children's playground facilities; the housing mix of the proposal compared to the housing needs of the Borough.

Officers responded as follows:

Principal Planning Officer:

1. It would be possible to convert the use of the study room to a third bedroom without a new planning application having to be made.
2. In total, there would be a net gain of four trees, 16 trees would be removed and replaced with 20 trees. This would be secured by condition.
3. The concerns regarding the design and character of the proposed development were recognised. Buildings of this design had been built in other parts of London. Although the previous, more traditional design had been viewed favourably, there were several reasons why it would not have worked, such as

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

- rooms adjacent to the top floor would only have roof lights, which were not the most practical for modern living.
4. With regards to the character and appearance of the building, whilst it was different, it was not considered to be harmful to the surrounding area. The development site was sufficiently divorced from the neighbouring properties to provide an opportunity for a contemporary design, which Officers did not consider to be unattractive.
 5. Provision had not been made in the proposal for children's' playgrounds within the site. Should a number of families move into the properties and a real need was identified by the management company a suitable area would be developed. There was no other mechanism to install such a facility on the site. Officers had not seen the need make such a provision at the application stage.
 6. It was acknowledged that compromises have had to be made in the consideration of the proposal's height and massing of the development. This was not considered to be harmful in the wider sense and would bring benefits to the local community.
 7. It was also acknowledged that Enfield's Core Strategy (2010) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (2015) were out of date and attracted less weight when compared to the London Plan.
 8. A view had been taken of the housing mix contained in the proposed development and the housing needs of the Borough. Officers were of the view that the benefits outweigh any harm. The Section 106 agreement would benefit many people across the Borough.
 9. No other comments had been received in addition to those from the Urban Design Team, which was internal to the Council. There was no other body to consult.
 10. The taller building was not considered to be harmful to the wider community or neighbouring area.
 11. There were no concerns which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits having regard to the titled balance and the presumption in favour of approving sustainable residential development.
 12. Each site was assessed on its own merits, with this particular proposal the more units which could be built would result in higher financial returns which would give a greater number of affordable housing.
 13. Potentially, this would result in more family units for less money.

Urban Design Lead & Deputy Team Manager

1. The proposed application had to be considered in the context that the site had an established extant planning permission.
2. The development site was not in the conservation area.
3. The applicant had entered into early discussions with the Council and had originally proposed an unbroken development.
4. Pitched roofs, proposed in the earlier design, did not match the contemporary design.

Head of Development Management

1. Reiterated that, on balance, the benefits to be gained from the proposed development outweighed the scale and mass of the proposed development.
2. A planning assessment had been carried out and the proposed development was not considered to be harmful to the visual impact of the area.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

On being put to the vote there were six votes for, four against and one abstention.

AGREED that:

1. That subject to the finalisation of a S106 to secure the matters covered in this report and to be appended to the decision notice, the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions. (as reported and amended)
2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the recommendation section of the report.

6 21/03247/OUT - Garages Meyer Green Enfield EN1 4NG

The introduction by Lap Pan Chong, Principal Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals and updates following the publication of the agenda.

Written representations against the officer's recommendation received separately from residents, Nick Churcher and Sarah Rickard had been circulated ahead of the meeting.

The response of Simon Chouffot (Applicant) and Nour Sinno (HTA Design LLP, Agent).

Members' debate and questions responded to by officers:

General statements:

1. Although the proposal was acceptable in planning terms it was back land development.
2. There were issues regarding the proximity of the site to the existing neighbouring properties.

Trees:

1. The number of trees to be planted compared to those to be removed was insufficient.
2. Although the trees which were to be removed were not of great value, they enhanced the environment and provided greenery to a non-designated heritage asset (i.e. New River) located next to the proposed development.
3. A condition to increase the number of replacement trees should be required.

The Principal Planning Officer responded:

4. Twelve, category U and C trees would be removed, and nine replacement trees would be planted. The landscaping condition (condition 13) could be amended to secure additional replacement trees and specify the minimum number of replacement trees (12).
5. The Ash tree is protected by a Tree Protection Order.

Traffic:

1. The proposed parking layout, in a very heavily parked area, when alternative spaces were at least a five-minute walk away where inadequate.
2. The number of parking spaces would not work.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

The Head of Traffic and Transportation reported that:

3. Vehicle tracking had confirmed that fire appliances were able to access the site in the event of an emergency.
4. Although the site was a back land development, access and parking had been assessed and found to be safe.
5. London Fire Brigade had confirmed that access for emergency vehicles was acceptable and had confirmed that the proposed layout with six parking spaces was satisfactory.

Construction Materials:

1. It was difficult to gain a clear image of the finished development in context with the existing surrounding properties from the presentation slides.
2. The slides showed examples of other developments and did not clearly show the exact materials which would be used at this site.
3. Physical samples of the building materials, particularly the colour of the exterior finishes, such as the bricks to be used would enable members to make an informed decision should be brought to the meetings of the Planning Committee at the appropriate time.

The Principal Planning Officer responded:

1. The proposed masonry blocks are mainly terracotta-coloured and had been selected considering a basket of factors. Officers have reviewed the samples of the proposed masonry blocks. Given the architectural styles in the area varies, the proposed masonry would not harm the character of the area. The details of the construction materials to be used and samples had been conditioned and would be selected carefully.

Communal Refuse Store:

1. The location of the communal refuse store, at approximately 30 metres, was a considerable distance from the properties and would not encourage residents to place their refuse in the bins on a day-to-day basis.
2. The location of the communal refuse store was impractical on a day-to-day basis and would encourage fly-tipping and not just by residents.
3. Fly-tipping across the Borough was an increasing problem, one which was resource intensive.
4. The position of the communal refuse store, on a corner, was considered to have been selected for the convenience of the refuse collection vehicles rather than the convenience of the residents. Access to the site was too narrow for the large vehicles.
5. Access to the store, if secured by a padlock, would discourage residents from using the store. Residents would be less likely to return to their property if they had forgotten their key.
6. The communal refuse store was considered to be located too near to the neighbour at 89 Worcesters Avenue.
7. Refuse stores should be located outside individual premises, which would encourage residents to separate their rubbish for recycling.
8. The standalone refuse store may be suitable but not in the proposed location. Possible solutions could be relocating the communal refuse store to nearer the properties or the provision of individual bins for each property. Closer proximity

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

of the bins to the proprietaries would encourage residents to increase their recycling.

The Principal Planning Officer responded:

1. The Waste Team had been consulted and conducted a site visit. Different refuse collection options had been explored. The position of the on-site communal refuse area, which would be lockable with a keypad, had been identified as the most suitable location, which gave access to the refuse vehicles. The future residents would only need to carry their bin bags to the communal refuse store instead of dragging wheelie bins to the refuse collection points on either Meyer Green or Worcesters Avenue. The communal refuse store would also be fully covered, enclosed and integrated with soft landscaping to deter fly tipping and reduce visual and amenity impacts on the existing residents. This arrangement was considered as a reasonable compromise

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Chouffot (Applicant), reassured the Committee that the issues raised regarding the collection and disposal of refuse would be re-examined and a manageable solution would be found. He confirmed that the lady who resided near the proposed refuse store had been consulted and had not expressed any concerns regarding the proximity of the refuse store in relation to her property. Careful consideration had been given to the landscaping around the refuse store. However, the Company was committed to improving the proposal through negotiation with the Council. It was not their intention to make problems for the existing and future residents.

In conclusion:

The Head of Development Management confirmed that on balance there would be no overall harm caused by the proposed development. A number of options regarding the location of the communal refuse store and the operation of day-to-day refuse disposal by residents and collection by the refuse vehicles had been considered. A managed arrangement could be further explored with the applicant which could be included into an additional condition, subject to the agreement of the Chair.

On being put to the vote there was unanimous support for the officer's recommendation subject to two additional conditions: i) specifying at least 12 replacement trees to be planted and ii) requesting details of the managed arrangements for refuse collection to avoid the need for a standalone refuse store.

AGREED:

1. That the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the report and the two additional conditions in relation to trees and refuse collection and disposal; and
2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the recommendation section of the report and the two additional conditions in relation to trees and refuse collection and disposal.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

3. That the final approval of details of the managed solution, be agreed in consultation with the Chair.

7 **21/04651/HOU - 33 Willow Walk, London, N21 1NG**

NOTED

1. The introduction by Gideon Whittingham, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
2. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers recommendation.

AGREED that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions as set out in the report of officers.

8 **22/00004/RE4 - Carpark, 291 High Street, EN3 4DN**

NOTED

1. The introduction by David Gittens, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
2. Members questions responded by the Head of Traffic and Transportation:
 - a. The carpark would remain for the use of the library.
 - b. Temporary consent had been in place for some time and there were no concerns regarding continued community use or loss on car parking.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers recommendation.

AGREED that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions as set out in the report of officers.

Councillor Doug Taylor, having declared a non-pecuniary interest remained in the room but did not participate in either the discussion or vote of this item.

9 **22/00640/RE4 - 11 and 11B North Way, London, N9 0AD**

NOTED

1. The introduction by Gideon Whittingham, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
2. Members' questions responded to by officers;
 - i. The facility would accommodate only Enfield residents, there would not be any guests from other London Boroughs.
 - ii. Residents, in the existing accommodation, now had enclosed pods with doors which had replaced the curtains shown in the photographs during the presentation. This ensured that residents would always have private space available for their own use.
 - iii. This layout would be used in the proposed development.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers recommendation.

AGREED that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

10 **FUTURE MEETING DATES**

PLANNING COMMITTEE - Tuesday, 26th April, 2022

Noted that the future meetings of the Planning Committee would be agreed at on 25 May 2022 at Annual Council.

The Chair announced that the date of the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be in June 2022 and would be confirmed at Annual Council. He went on to thank all Members for their contribution to the meetings throughout the year and wished everyone well in the future.

Members unanimously thanked Councillor Sinan Boztas for his work as Chair of the Planning Committee during the last year.

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm