# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 2023

## **COUNCILLORS**

PRESENT Sinan Boztas (Chair), Mahym Bedekova (Vice Chair), Josh

Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Thomas Fawns, Ahmet Hasan, Bektas Ozer, Jim Steven, Eylem Yuruk,

and Reece Fox.

**OFFICERS:** Brett Leahy (Director of Planning and Growth), Claire Williams

(Planning Decisions Manager), Karolina Grebowiec-Hall (Principal Planner), Nicholas Page (Conservation & Heritage

Adviser), Lucy Merryfellow (Senior Transport Planner, Journeys & Places), John Hood (Legal Adviser), and Harry

Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

**Also Attending:** Kew Planning representatives, applicant and agent

representatives, members of the public, deputees, press, and

officers observing.

### 1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Michael Rye OBE, who was substituted by Cllr Reece Fox.

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Thomas Fawns.

### 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Mahym Bedekova disclosed a non-pecuniary interest on item 7, application reference 23/00770/FUL, as she knew and had used the agent's services previously. Cllr Bedekova would leave the meeting during discussions and voting on this application.

### 3 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Received the report of the Head of Development Management, which was **NOTED**.

## 4 20/01982/FUL - LAND REAR OF ELLINGTON COURT, SOUTHGATE N14 6LB

Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

The officer provided Members with an update, in the form of written representations submitted by the Arnos Grove Ward Councillors, Cllrs Paul Pratt and Adrian Grumi. Neither were able to attend to make a deputation, but wished for their opposition to the application to be voiced. They were in agreement with objections made and with the points which would be presented by the deputees.

Officers advised that obscure glaze from top level open windows on the Eastern elevation would need to be secured through condition.

A deputation was received from Roger Hepher, HGH consulting, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

A deputation was received from Denise Gandhi, Southgate Green Association, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

The agent, Julian Sutton, spoke in response.

The Chair informed Cllr Fawns that as he had arrived after this item had begun, he would be unable to participate in discussions and voting on this item.

Officers responded to Members' questions and comments in respect of impact on surrounding heritage assets and mitigation of harm to the conservation area.

Officers responded to Member's enquiries regarding policy. The application for the top floor of the existing Ellington Court building was made in 2019, and was assessed against relevant planning policy at the time. Officers confirmed that land ownership certification was addressed, and that consultation had taken place.

Officers also responded to Member's queries regarding the day/sun light report, trees, fire safety and access, parking space, the housing mix, and amenity space.

In respect of access for emergency vehicles, officers advised that a condition for further information on access could be included.

The proposal having been put to the vote; Members voted:

7 FOR 4 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED:

1. That the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report and

discussed at the meeting, specifically relating to access for emergency vehicles.

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 original report dated 18 July 2023 and set out in this report.

# 5 20/03011/FUL - MOORFIELD FAMILY CENTRE, 2 MOORFIELD ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 5PS

Kathryn Williams, Kew Planning, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

An addendum report/update had been sent to Members in advance of the meeting, which provided assessments on a few outstanding technical matters which needed further information, this related to the housing mix, transport and parking, design, flood risk/drainage, and the draft Heads of Terms agreement.

Officers responded to Member's questions and comments regarding crime and antisocial behaviour. Planning representatives highlighted that the conditions would address the Police comments, that further discussions would take place regarding the details, and the Police would be engaged with/consulted on these.

In response to Member's queries regarding travel and parking, planning representatives advised that the proposals fell under a controlled parking zone, and the applicant would be making a financial contributions. The provision of parking would be looked at in greater detail, as part of the parking management plan.

Planning representatives responded to Member's enquiries regarding drainage and flood mitigation. An evacuation plan and further drainage strategy were said to still be required, and would be secured by condition.

Planning representatives also responded to Member's queries regarding design, scaling/mass, trees, amenity space, and the housing mix.

Members had ongoing concerns with regards to crime and anti-social behaviour mitigation.

Cllr Yuruk proposed a countermotion, that a decision on the application be deferred, in order to allow for further consultation/engagement with the Metropolitan Police to take place. This was seconded by Cllr Chamberlain.

Brett Leahy, Director of Planning and Growth, advised that there were conditions in place to control this, and that they could present the details submitted as part of that condition back to committee for approval at the relevant stage, to ensure that the crime mitigation measures satisfy Members'

concerns. Planning representatives confirmed that CCTV was one of the items that could be conditioned at the detail stage.

This counterproposal, having been put to the vote; Members voted:

5 FOR 7 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, this countermotion was not agreed.

Brett Leahy, Director of Planning and Growth, advised that the details of the condition would need to be approved, and they would consult with the Metropolitan Police, who would need to be satisfied with the details before they could proceed.

Officer's original recommendation, having been put to the vote; Members voted:

8 FOR 3 AGAINST 1 ABSTENTION

and so, it was AGREED:

- 1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions outlined in the report and discussed at the meeting, specifically relating to crime mitigation, and the completion of a S106 legal agreement.
- 2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the S106 Agreement and agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 21:00, for a short break, and the meeting resumed at 21:10.

# 6 22/04095/RE3 - LAND ADJACENT TO THE NEW RIVER EXTENDING FROM TENNISWOOD ROAD TO BULLSMOOR LANE

Karolina Grebowiec-Hall, Principal Planner, introduced the report, and highlighted the key aspects of the application.

A deputation was received from Paul Hammond, a local resident, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

The officer read the written representations/comments submitted by Cllr Rye. This included: disappointment that the concerns, particularly regarding privacy, were not addressed when initially raised, continued opposition to this section of the river being opened up, but welcome of the changes/improvements which had been made.

Sarah Whitehouse (Neighbourhood Workstream Lead) and David Hilliard (Enfield Cycle), spoke in response.

In response to Member's queries regarding the alternate route, officers advised that the applicant had assessed the alternative, but found the benefits of the scheme as it was proposed, far outweighed the costs of the alternative route; and steps had been taken to mitigate the impact on privacy.

Officers confirmed how members of the public would access the path, that amenities such as a crossing and lights would be added to improve it, and the gates to access that section of the new river would be open permanently. Officers confirmed that scooters and motorbikes were not permitted by law to access the path, CCTV was proposed to be installed to provide an extra deterrent, and that further details would be conditioned to ensure they did not invade privacy.

Officers provided further details regarding privacy and screening, of the rear gardens of Sinclaire Close.

Members had ongoing concerns with regards to residents' privacy.

The proposal having been put to the vote; Members voted:

8 FOR 3 AGAINST 1 ABSTENTION

and so, it was AGREED:

1. That in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report and discussed at the meeting, specifically relating to CCTV.

2. That the Head of Development Management be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of the original report dated 18 April 2023.

#### MEETING TIME EXTENSION

**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 30 minutes to enable the remaining agenda items to continue to be considered.

## 7 23/00770/FUL - 55 EVERSLEY PARK ROAD, LONDON N21 1NR

## CHANGE TO AGENDA ORDER

The Committee agreed to alter the order in which the items on the agenda were considered at the meeting. The minutes reflect the order of items as listed on the agenda.

#### MEETING TIME EXTENSION

**AGREED** that the rules of procedure within the Council's Constitution relating to the time meetings should end (10:00pm) be suspended for a further 30 minutes to enable the remaining agenda items to continue to be considered.

Cllr Bedekova would leave the meeting for discussions and voting on this item, having declared that she knew and had used the agent's services previously.

Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

The officer updated/informed Members that a day/sunlight report had been submitted by the planning agent, which demonstrated that the proposal would be in accordance with BRE guidelines, and it would be conditioned that top-level windows not open above 1.7m from floor/ground level.

A deputation was received from Mahesh Patel, a local resident, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

A deputation was received from Cllr Elisa Morreale, Southgate Ward Councillor, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

The agent, Murat Aydemir, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments and questions from Members in respect of the street scene and character of the area. A condition could be attached to ensure that the flat roof would not be used by occupants of the property, and that the windows would be obscure glazed. The basement could not be seen from the street and conditions were attached relating to flood risk assessment. Officers considered the application had addressed the shortcomings which saw it refused previously.

In response to Member's queries regarding design, officers advised that the materials used would respect the area; there was a condition proposed for details of external materials to be submitted, and these would need to be in keeping with nearby homes. The day/sunlight report was in accordance with guidelines and would not impact/overshadow neighbouring properties.

The proposal having been put to the vote; Members voted:

11 FOR 0 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED unanimously:

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 this report.

## 8 23/01144/FUL - 59 LANGHAM GARDENS, LONDON N21 1DL

Claire Williams, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

A deputation was received from Moira Stowe, a local resident, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

A deputation was received from Cllr Andy Milne, Grange Park Ward Councillor, who spoke against officers' recommendation.

Marco Belatri, representing the applicant/agent spoke in response.

Officers responded to Member's queries regarding the details and rules of the HMO. The floor plans showed 6 bedrooms and there would be a condition to ensure that a maximum of 6 people occupied the property. Planning had suggested an informative be attached to permission, to encourage the applicant to engage with the Police to look at addressing the issues raised.

In response to Member's queries regarding what would follow were Members minded to refuse the application, officers advised that it would be for planning enforcement to take action.

In response to Member's queries regarding the quality of the HMO, officers advised that substantial weight had been given to the quality of the accommodation, that licensing enforcement were happy the proposals complied with requirements, and it exceeded the minimum space standards/policy. It was confirmed that no external changes were sought, and a condition was proposed for roof lights to be obscure glazed, and that top-level windows not open above 1.7m from floor/ground level, which would help reduce overlooking/ privacy concerns.

The Chair proposed a countermotion, that planning permission be refused on the basis of: the proposal is out of keeping with the character of the area; environmental impacts, specifically on antisocial behaviour; loss of privacy and overlooking; increase of pollution; and overcrowding. This was seconded by Cllr Bedekova.

This counterproposal, having been put to the vote; Members voted:

12 FOR 0 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED unanimously:

That planning permission be **REFUSED**, for the reasons set out above.

## 9 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Members noted the dates of future meetings as set out in the reports pack.

The Chair thanked everyone for their time, and the meeting ended at 22:59.