# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 18 JULY 2023

### COUNCILLORS

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

Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Thomas Fawns, Alessandro Georgiou, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim

Steven, and Eylem Yuruk.

**ABSENT** Peter Fallart and Bektas Ozer

**OFFICERS:** Brett Leahy (Director of Planning and Growth), Andy Higham

(Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Claire Williams (Planning Decisions Manager), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport

Planner), Nicholas Page (Conservation & Heritage Adviser),

Dino Ustic (Senior Planning Officer), Lap-Pan Chong (Principal Planning Officer), Karolina Grebowiec-Hall

(Principal Planner), John Hood (Legal Representative), and

Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

**Also Attending:** 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 Bektas Ozer, and Cllr Peter Fallart who was substituted by Cllr Alessandro Georgiou.

Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Sinan Boztas (Chair) and Cllr Thomas Fawns.

## 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was received from Cllr Alessandro Georgiou, who would give a deputation on item 6, Application Reference 21/02546/FUL. Having sought advice from the legal representative, he would make this deputation, then withdraw from the meeting during discussions and voting on the application.

### 3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

On the item regarding Churchbury Lane, Application Reference 22/02248/FUL, Cllr Rye said that members wanted to know if there were any standards from social services for amenity space for supported living of this

nature, and asked that this be clearly reflected/ added to the minutes, this was seconded by Cllr Boztas (Chair).

**AGREED** the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 20 June 2023 as a correct record, with the above amendment.

## 4 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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

## 5 22/03123/VAR - 241 GREEN ST, ENFIELD, EN3 7SJ

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

She responded to Members' queries in respect of the additional staircase, to advise that there was adequate separation, that they were easily accessed and that they had been reviewed by HSE and Enfield Building Control and confirmed to be compliant. The addition of the second staircase was confirmed to be a requirement as part of the application seeking to reduce the affordable housing offer.

It was explained that the reduction in affordable units had triggered the requirement for a viability assessment, that the recent economic/ build cost challenges had been considered, and found that 25% affordable units was what was viable. The officer expressed that 37 units (25% of the total units) were being offered at a discounted market rate of 30%, and would be secured by a section 106 and held as intermediate in perpetuity, and that 111 units were for the private market. The officer confirmed that the decision notice for the application was issued in March 2022 and the application had been considered by committee in December 2020. With regards to the intermediate units, the officer said that the highest priority need was for 1 and 2 bed units which was what proposal sought to allocate for, and that the deviation from market compliance was not significantly different from what had been approved, with the level of non-compliance remaining largely the same.

Members expressed that officers should have informed the committee that the original application had not been viability tested, and asked that in future officers advise on the level of confidence they have in the viability of affordable accommodation being offered. The Head of Development Management appreciated that a change in the affordable housing had been made in this new/separate application/proposal. The Director of Planning and Growth added that the framework in which assessments are made was set by policy, that the viability had been tested and was reflective of current economic circumstances.

In response to Member's queries regarding the reduction in car parking spaces, Mike Hoyland, Senior Transport Planner, advised that there was a

reduction in 2 and 3 bed units, thus a fall in demand for parking, and that the proposals complied with the London Plan.

Members had ongoing concerns with regards to the reduction in the offer for social housing.

The Chair, in consultation with the legal representative advised that Cllr Fawns could not take part in the discussion or vote on the issue having arrived late during the item.

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

6 FOR 2 AGAINST 2 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED:

- 1. That in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to referral of the application to the Greater London Authority and the completion of a Deed of Variation to the original s106 Agreement to secure the matters covered in this 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 finalise the wording of the Deed of Variation to the original s106 Agreement and agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

# 6 21/02546/FUL - 368 COCKFOSTERS ROAD, BARNET, EN4 0JT

Cllr Georgiou, having sought advice from the legal representative, would make his deputation, then withdraw from the meeting during discussions and voting on the application.

Dino Ustic, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

The officer provided the following updates: condition 19 in the report regarding energy saving measures had made reference to building regulations 2013 which had been updated to 2021; the agent had agreed to an additional condition to secure a minimum net biodiversity gain of 10% on/as close to the site as possible, as per the London Plan 2021; an additional condition for an arboricultural method statement to be provided; and the proposed CIL estimate had changed from £250,000 to £226,992, due to using the Enfield CIL calculator which was more precise.

A deputation was received from Cllr Alessandro Georgiou, Cockfosters Ward Councillor, who spoke against the officers' recommendation. Cllr Georgiou

then withdraw from the meeting during discussions and voting on the application.

The agent, Mr Graham Fisher, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments and questions, and advised that the number of trees referenced in paragraph 4.3, included those located along the shared boundary, that the appeal decision at 37 Lancaster Road was not relevant to and included different issues such as overlooking which were not an issue on this application, and that the sun/day light reports complied with the quidelines.

In response to Member's queries regarding parking, Mike Hoyland, Senior Transport Planner, advised that parking space was compliant with policy. Cycle parking met London Plan standards. The vehicle access was similar to neighbouring properties, and that the car park was big enough to accommodate deliveries.

In response to Member's queries regarding the affordable housing contribution, Sharon Davidson advised that only one unit could have been accommodated, thus an offsite contribution was considered more appropriate.

In response to Member's queries regarding trees, officers confirmed the trees being removed, and that there was a condition that a minimum of 6 trees would be replanted.

In response to Member's queries regarding design, officers advised that the size/bulk/scale/mass/footprint of neighbouring properties were similar if not larger than what was being proposed, that the building was set in from the boundaries by 1.5m and designed to reduce the appearance of mass.

In response to Member's queries regarding storage space, officers advised that the gross internal area compensated for the lack of storage space.

Members had ongoing concerns with regards to parking/ transport.

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

7 FOR 3 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED:

- 1. That subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the obligations set out in this 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 and the final S106 Agreement to cover the matters identified in the S106 Contributions section of the report.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 20:24, to give members a rest break, and asked that Cllr Georgiou be invited to re-join the meeting, the meeting resumed at 20:31.

# 7 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 details of two representations, the first of which was an update from Southgate Green Association, who asked that the application be deferred for consideration, as they still had concerns with the scheme relating to heritage assets and amenity of the residents of Ellington Court. A resident had also asked for their concerns/ objections to be read out, these included: the distance of the new building to the boundary, the impact on heritage assets, overlooking/ privacy issues, and the fact that permitted development rights may allow the developer to increase the height of the building.

Officers responded to comments and questions, and advised that there was a distance of 74m between the rear boundary of the site and the rear of 4 and 5 The Green (Grade 2 star listed properties), and that this was added to by the distance the building was set away from the boundary. With vegetation and the reduction from 3 to 2 storeys, there was not concern about the heritage impact on the listed buildings, and that the wall would not be impacted.

In response to Member's queries regarding access, officers advised that vehicle access would be limited to the existing car park of Ellington Court, and that the new building was being designed to only have pedestrian access. Emergency services would be able to access the site with more than sufficient space to accommodate even the larger emergency vehicles.

In response to Member's queries regarding permitted development rights, the officer replied that a condition was proposed to remove permitted development.

In response to Member's queries regarding transport, officers advised that the site would make use of the 11 existing parking spaces available at Ellington Court, that 18 cycle spaces were proposed, and further details on additional spaces would be a condition.

In response to Member's queries regarding the reduction of garden space for the existing block, officers advised that the proposal would leave more than sufficient communal space as it relates to policy.

In response to Member's queries regarding consultation, officers advised that only 2 objections had been received, that the neighbouring properties were

consulted, notices were posted/ advertised, and discussions had taken place on the original application. The reduction in scale did not require reconsultation. The officer confirmed that Walker Primary School were consulted on the application and had raised no objections.

Cllr Rye proposed a countermotion, that a decision on the application be deferred, until a site visit could be conducted, on the grounds that it would: help members to take into account the context of the site, the conservation issues, the issues of overlooking, and the loss of garden space. This was seconded by Cllr Georgiou.

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

6 FOR 4 AGAINST 1 ABSTENTION

and so, it was AGREED:

That a decision on the application be deferred, until a Member site visit could be conducted at a future date.

# 8 23/00824/FUL - HERITAGE HOUSE 345 SOUTHBURY ROAD ENFIELD EN1 1TW

Lap-Pan Chong, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

In response to Member's queries regarding consultation, the officer advised that 2 objections had been received regarding light and noise impact, particularly during construction. The Poppy Drive resident's association had been consulted during the pre-application process, and at the application stage no comments were received.

In response to Member's queries regarding construction, the officer advised that there was a construction logistic plan as part of condition 15, which aimed to minimise the impact on residents. The officer added that the demolition phase was planned to last around 6 months and the construction phase around 18 months. A condition on dust control measures had been approved and would be followed through with at the appropriate stage. Mike Hoyland, Senior Transport Planner, confirmed that the construction phase operating outside of school/ work rush hours was a key consideration in order to avoid unnecessary additional congestion.

In response to Member's queries regarding overshadowing, the officer advised that the relevant guidance and assessments had been followed and complied with.

In response to Member's queries regarding unfeasible secondary pedestrian cycle access, the officer advised that the options had been explored with the

applicant, but was not viable, and that other methods of promoting active travel had been pursued, such as the 2 way cycle lane, cycle parking, and the financial contribution.

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

11 FOR 0 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTIONS

and so, it was AGREED unanimously:

- 1. That subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the matters covered in this 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 Section 106 Agreement and the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

# 9 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

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

The Head of Development Management advised that the provisional committee meeting dates scheduled for 1 and 29 August 2023, would not be required, and thus that the next meeting would take place on 5 September 2023.

The meeting ended at 21:42.