

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2024**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Sinan Boztas (Chair), Mahym Bedekova (Vice Chair), Josh Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Ahmet Hasan, Bektas Ozer, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, and Eylem Yuruk.

**OFFICERS:** Karen Page (Head of Planning and Building Control), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Karolina Grebowiec-Hall (Principal Planner), Eloise Kiernan (Principal Planning Officer), Amma Busia (Planning Officer), Joseph Aggar (Principal Planner), Aaron Hawkins (Senior Planning Officer), Gideon Whittingham (Planning Decisions Manager), Chris Cole (Head of Strategic Transport Planning & Policy), Michael Kennedy (Principal Urban Designer), John Hood (Legal Adviser), and Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

**Also Attending:** Applicant and agent representatives, deputees, members of the public, press, Attigo Trust representative, and officers observing.

**1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Thomas Fawns.

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Lee Chamberlain declared a non-pecuniary interest, as a Member of the North London Model Flying Club, who practiced within the boundary of the site on item 7, application reference 23/03142/RE4. Cllr Chamberlain would leave the meeting during discussions and voting on this application.

**3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 23 January 2024 were **AGREED**.

**4 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL**

Received the report of the Head of Planning and Building Control, which was **NOTED**.

**5 23/01848/FUL - VACANT TFL HIGHWAYS LAND FORMALLY COMPRISING NO'S 108-112 PALMERSTON CRESCENT, LONDON, N13 4NG**

Eloise Kiernan, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

In response to Members' queries regarding scale, officers advised that the application was for two buildings, block A ranging in height from 3 to 6 storeys and block B at 6 storeys. The applicant would not be able to vary the height, and had to comply with the drawings.

In response to Members' questions and comments relating to transport, officers responded that a controlled parking zone (CPZ) would offset some of the parking issues in the surrounding area. Access provided by a turning head would allow for better servicing, and would be a shared surface with the cycle way; this improved/ rationalised amendment would make it a safer and more pleasant space for all. The only parking provision being provided by the development was three disabled spaces for the three accessible units, which was served by the undercroft. Although the process for implementing a CPZ is outside the planning process, officers would try to seek payment from the developer at the earliest opportunity to design and engage with residents over the CPZ, and have it in place as soon as possible.

In response to Members' enquiries regarding distancing/ separations, officers replied that there was a frontage, with a planting buffer between the building and the North Circular Road. Residential units had been pulled back from the road, with no primary residential amenity on the ground floor sitting along it, and the buildings were angled so that all principal views did not overlook the North Circular. The distance to the neighbouring property 106, was said to be 1.6m to the common boundary and 3.5m to the building at the front, and tapering to just under 2m at the back. Concerns regarding overlooking at the north elevation in block A, were mitigated by them being non-habitable or secondary windows which could be conditioned to have obscure glass. In block B there was a separation of 15m, landscaping which created shielding, and the non-habitable windows could also be conditioned. Most of the windows affected by day/sun light loss served non-habitable rooms, and in the instance where a habitable room was affected there were other sources of light.

In response to Members' questions relating to trees, officers advised that some category b trees had to be lost to allow for meaningful development, as they were located in the middle of the site, but they had done their best to maintain as much as possible and use the amenity space effectively. Eight trees would be replanted, and if there was space, officers would try to secure additional trees through condition in the landscaping scheme, but they wanted to ensure the trees had enough space to thrive.

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

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2024**

1. That subject to the completion of a S106 to secure the matters covered in this report, the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.
2. That Head of Planning & Building Control be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the S106 Agreement and the planning conditions listed in the report. This includes the conditions discussed relating to: obscure windows, the landscaping plan, and to demarcate the shared turning head space if possible.

**6 23/02832/FUL - 14 MAXIM ROAD, LONDON N21 1EX**

Amma Busia, Planning Officer, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application. A day/sun light report submitted by one of the objectors regarding the impact on their property was shared with Members, and officers reiterated their response to this, as had been outlined in the report.

A deputation was received from Cllr Julian Sampson, representing the Ward Councillors, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

A deputation was received from Costas Constantinou, and Lauren & Kieran James, local residents, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

The applicant, Joachim Sander, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments in respect of the height and mass of the building, advising that there were other two storey and semi-detached properties in the street. The building would stand slightly higher than neighbouring properties, but reflected the change in road level. The amended scheme was considered acceptable in the street scene context and would not result in more than marginal planning harm. The building had been brought in from the boundary to allow for a metre separation.

In response to Members' queries relating to distancing/ separation, officers responded that whilst there was day/sun light impact on a neighbouring property window, the room affected was served by/ received light from other sources. Due to the height of the Velux windows, it was unlikely that somebody would be able to look out and down through them, but they could be conditioned to be obscured glazed.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding parking, officers replied that Transport had raised no objection to the four-bed dwelling providing two spaces, and there would be a unilateral undertaking to prevent car parking on street.

In response to Members' enquiries relating to materials, officers advised that there was a condition in place to control the materials and colours to ensure they were consistent with those in the street.

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

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2024

1. The Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement; including an additional condition requiring the roof lights to flank elevations to be obscure glazed.
2. The Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the Section 106 Agreement and agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

### **7 23/03142/RE4 - 90 HECTARES OF LAND LYING BETWEEN BOTANY BAY (SOUTH) AND THE M25 (NORTH)**

Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application. Updates provided in a previously circulated addendum report were reasserted.

Cllr Chamberlain would leave the meeting for discussions and voting on this item, having declared that he was a Member of the North London Model Flying Club, who practiced within the boundary of the site.

A deputation was received from Cllr Joanne Laban, Ward Councillor, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

A deputation was received from Kevin Lynskey, a local resident, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

The agent, Michael Graham, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments in respect of discrepancies in the documentation, advising that the application had been assessed based on the 1.6 million cubic meter capacity. There had been a level of preapplication consultation undertaken by the applicant, and 101 letters had been sent out in reference to the planning application.

In response to Members' questions regarding transport, officers responded that restrictions for vehicle movements reflected the planning permission for the adjoining site which had similar vehicle movements. The morning travel peak was described as more extreme than the afternoon/ evening peak, as school and work times coincided, as opposed to being more spread out in the afternoon/ evening. Monitors were being added to the Ridgeway close to the hospital which would allow for improved monitoring of the traffic. Officers could look into considering additional cameras from an enforcement viewpoint if vehicles were not using the prescribed left in, right out proposal. The council would investigate vehicles which did not leave the site through the correct route, and the proposed scheme had stronger contractual controls than previously. There was potential for officers to attend and manage vehicles at the site; independent consultants also visited and monitored this, and there was 24-hour CCTV in operation. There would be a condition attached to planning permission requiring the submission of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP). As landowner, through the contractual process,

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2024

the council would control and penalise if contractors at the site breached the approved CEMP.

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

1. That in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, the Head of Planning and Building Control be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.
2. That the Head of Planning and Building Control be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters set out in the Recommendation section of this report.

### **8 23/02385/FUL - HOUNDSFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, RIPON ROAD, LONDON, N9 7RE**

Joseph Aggar, Principal Planner, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

In response to Members' queries regarding the application's expiration, officers replied that following the previous application's expiration in March 2022 there had been pre-application discussion with the applicant team in respect of whether that part of the Metropolitan Open Land would be de-designated. Were permission to be granted, permission for the application would begin from the day it was issued. It was conveyed that the applicant could apply in the coming years to make the permission/ building permanent, but this couldn't be conditioned, and whether such permission would be appropriate, given it was a modular construction and on Metropolitan Open Land, would then need to be considered. Officers had no concerns as to the condition of the building but agreed with Members that the long-term strategy of the site and SEND provision in the borough needed to be better understood.

In response to Members' questions and comments relating to whether the educational need persisted, an Attigo Trust representative explained that the planning permission came to light during the conversion process of the school in 2019, and they had been working to resolve the application. It had been reduced from a three to two form entry school, but every classroom was used and the school had recently been upgraded to 'good' by Ofsted. The school was said to support a variety of groups in the community and would be providing long term SEND places.

Members expressed dissatisfaction at the lack of information provided to them regarding the reduction from three to two forms of entry and diversification to provide additional SEND places, in addition to Education representatives having not attended to explain more. Officers expressed that they had received late written representation from the Education department which set out that a further thirty SEN places would be provided by the school which would help meet the need in the borough.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2024

In response to Members' enquiries regarding transport, officers advised that there would be no change in servicing and delivery, which would continue to access the site from Doncaster Road.

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

1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.
2. That the Head of Planning & Building Control be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

### **9 23/02493/VAR - THE ROYAL CHACE HOTEL, 162 THE RIDGEWAY, ENFIELD, EN2 8AR**

Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report, highlighting the key aspects of the application.

In response to Members' questions relating to process, officers responded that a decision on the application was Enfield Council's, and it was not a referable scheme for the GLA.

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

1. That subject to the completion of a deed of variation to link the development to the Section 106 Agreement previously secured for 21/01816/FUL, and to reflect the resulting changes to the shared ownership provisions within the current Section 106, the Head of Planning & Building Control be authorised to GRANT full planning permission subject to conditions.
2. That the Head of Planning & Building Control be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the deed of variation and conditions to cover those matters recommended in this report.

### **10 REVIEW OF APPEAL PERFORMANCE 2023/24**

Gideon Whittingham, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced and highlighted the key aspects of the report.

Members NOTED the report.

### **11 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Members NOTED that the dates of future meetings would be confirmed following Annual Council on Wednesday 15 May 2024.

The Chair thanked Members and officers for their time and contributions, and the meeting ended at 21:54.