

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 20 JUNE 2023**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Sinan Boztas (Chair), Josh Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Thomas Fawns, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, and Eylem Yuruk.

ABSENT Bektas Ozer and Mahym Bedekova

OFFICERS: Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport Planner), Michael Kennedy (Place Department), Kate Perry (Principal Planning Officer), Julie Thornton (Legal Services) and Claire Williams (Planning Decisions Manager), and Metin Halil (Secretary).

Also Attending: Applicant and agent representatives, and officers observing.

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from the following:

- Councillor Mahym Bedekova
- Councillor Bektas Ozer

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

NOTED

The following declarations of Interest were received:

1. Councillor Josh Abey declared a Non-Pecuniary interest that he was contacted as a ward councillor by the applicant for item 8, application reference: 22/02680/FUL.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 23 May 2023 were agreed.

4 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

The report of the Head of Development Management was **NOTED**.

5 23/00294/FUL - 1-44 AVALON CLOSE, ENFIELD, EN2 8LR

NOTED

1. Planning Officers have agreed to a request from the Agent for the application at 1-44 Avalon Close to be **withdrawn** from the Agenda so that further studies can be commissioned by the Applicant into the potential impact of the development and will Not be heard at Tuesdays (20 June 2023) Planning Committee.

6 22/01969/HOU - 11 PARK NOOK GARDENS ENFIELD EN2 0HT

NOTED

1. The introduction by Kate Perry, Principal Planning Officer, clarifying the proposal and the scheme.
2. The deputation of Councillor Hannah Dyson, Whitewebbs Ward Councillor on behalf of residents in objection to the application with the following concerns:
 - the bungalow (13 Park Nook Gardens) was just 90 cm from the boundary with the property at No.11. The proposed boundary would be 4m high and run within 90cm of the bungalow wall from front to back and directly in front of their kitchen window which is the main source of light into the kitchen.
 - The development would impact the physical and mental well being of the owners at No.13.
 - Owners at No.13 would have difficulty in accessing their property during the works.
 - Concerns about the foundations to No.13 as the bungalow was built in the 1930's on shallow foundations and cracks could occur due to the proximity of the proposed works.
3. The response of James Harries (Applicant).
4. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers.
5. During discussion, the following concerns were raised:
 - The distance between both properties at No.11 & No.13, which was 2m.
 - The height of the development which had been reduced to 2.8m from 3.2m.
 - Sunlight/daylight issues, which officers clarified that within the parameters of accessibility, this was acceptable for side facing windows and where there are other windows, daylight/sunlight assessment figures wasn't necessary for this scale of development.
 - Access during building works – this has to be maintained between neighbours with building control picking up any significant issues.
 - Comparison between the permitted development plan and the actual planning application plan.
6. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED

1. That the Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions.
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.

7 22/02248/FUL - 24-26 CHURCHBURY LANE, ENFIELD, EN1 3TY

NOTED

1. The introduction by Andy Higham, Head of Development Management, clarifying the proposal and the scheme.
2. The deputation of Kieran McCarthy (on behalf of the Churchbury Lane, Fyfield Road & Fir Tree Walk community) against the officers' recommendation.
3. The response of Savvas Michael (Applicant).
4. Members debate and questions responded to by officers.
5. During discussion, the following concerns were raised:
 - Clarity was sought regarding the traffic impact on the area, relating to the 19 rooms of the development and 20 staff. Accident records showed no accidents had occurred in this area in the last 23 years. Traffic calming improvements had been made in the area.
 - The need for this type of accommodation in the borough. Social Services team confirmed that there was no overwhelming demand in this borough which there may be elsewhere in London.
 - Compliance with the internal layout, planning was happy to accept a condition that details of compliance with the internal layout was provided and confirmed.
 - 20 staff at the development, these would be split on a shift basis with 10 working during the day and 10 at night. Since the appeal decision by the inspector, there has been the implementation of Churchbury Lane being closed at its junction with Parsonage Lane which has affected and changed the nature of traffic movements along that road.
 - Fire safety – a condition could be put in place to cover this and obtain a fire statement, but the main reliance would be under the building regulations.
 - Tree survey – officers had re-inspected the site and are satisfied that there had been no change in circumstances that would require another survey to be done and are therefore comfortable with the conclusions in the tree survey.
 - Loss of privacy/overlooking – this was for Members to make a judgement on. The flank elevation showed that there are windows that have been obscure glazed so members would

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20.6.2023

- have to judge what the loss of privacy is, as a result of those obscure glazed windows, to the neighbouring properties.
- Roof lights on the 2nd floor and obscure glazing in certain areas – Members were reminded of the requirements for a tilted balance. The nature of the accommodation meant that there are communal spaces that the residents could come out into and would benefit from other uses. These were not traditional flats. In planning terms there were no such regulations regarding roof lights, obscure glazing and whether rooms should also be doubles.
 - Supported living standards and challenging behaviour of residents – Residents could be stuck in rooms with only roof lights for ventilation if unable to be taken outside. A condition could be imposed detailing how rooflights could be controlled as regards opening them.
 - Communal areas/Amenity space. Members wanted to know if there were any standards from social services for amenity space for supported living of this nature.
6. The proposal by Councillor Rye to defer the application, seconded by Councillor Steven, for the following reasons:
- To provide certainty as to how the internal layout will work.
 - Regarding Trees – what is being retained, provided and any re-planting.
 - What amenity space is being offered for 1st and 2nd floor occupants, and if adequate.
 - Fire safety – to see if standards are being met.
 - To investigate if there are any access to daylight/sunlight issues.
7. The unanimous support for the motion to defer for the above reasons.

**Officers Recommendation NOT Agreed.
Application DEFERRED for further consideration.**

8 22/02680/FUL - UNITS 1A TO 1B ALEXANDER PLACE, NEW SOUTHGATE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, LOWER PARK ROAD, LONDON, N11 1QD

NOTED

1. The introduction by Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and the scheme.
2. Members debate and questions responded to by Officers including clarification of any daylight/sunlight issues, the height of the development, fire safety issues, the job generation of the scheme and clarification of the Section 106 process by the legal representative.
3. Additional conditions added as follows:
 - Details of Pedestrian & Cycle access
 - Refuse facilities
 - BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) will change from Outstanding to Excellent.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20.6.2023

4. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED

1. That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the obligations as set out in the report, the Head of Development Management be authorised to Grant planning permission subject to conditions.
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 this report.

9 DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Tuesday 4th July 2023 (provisional)
Tuesday 18th July 2023
Tuesday 1st August 2023 (provisional)
Tuesday 29th August 2023 (provisional)
Tuesday 5th September 2023 (provisional)
Tuesday 19th September 2023
Tuesday 17th October 2023
Tuesday 7th November 2023 (provisional)
Tuesday 21st November 2023
Tuesday 19th December 2023
Tuesday 9th January 2024 (provisional)
Tuesday 23rd January 2024
Tuesday 13th February 2024 (provisional)
Tuesday 20th February 2024
Tuesday 5th March 2024 (provisional)
Tuesday 19th March 2024
Tuesday 23rd April 2024

These meetings will commence at 7:00pm and will be held in the Conference Room at the Civic Centre.