

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2024**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Sinan Boztas (Chair), Mahym Bedekova (Vice Chair), Josh Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Thomas Fawns, Nelly Gyosheva, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, and Jim Steven.

OFFICERS: Karen Page (Head of Planning and Building Control), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Karolina Grebowiec-Hall (Principal Planner), John Neal (Senior Planning Officer), Michael Kennedy (Design and Heritage Manager), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport Planner), John Hood (Legal Adviser), and Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer).

Also Attending: Applicant and agent representatives, deputies, officer observing, and members of the public.

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bektas Ozer.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received regarding any item on the agenda.

3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on Tuesday 18 June 2024 and Tuesday 16 July 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 23/03663/FUL - 2 GIBSON CLOSE, LONDON, N21 1EG

John Neal, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report and highlighted the key aspects of the application. Members were reminded of the update report circulated that set out the full wording for the conditions listed in the officer report.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 17.9.2024

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

The agent, Nick Makasis, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments in respect of site sensitivity, advising that the closest neighbouring building was 30 metres from the proposed development and many of the surrounding properties had rear extensions/outbuildings. The building would be one storey lower than most surrounding properties, increasing in height by just 1.5 metres and trees provided shielding, thus minimising overlooking. Planning policy had changed since the original development was approved in 1995 and the site was suitable for the development of two family homes which were needed in the borough.

In response to Members' queries relating to transport, officers responded that there would be no change to the turning bay or access, one parking space per unit was sufficient, and the covenant mentioned in the deputation was a civil matter which fell outside of planning considerations/processes. For three or more-bedroom properties, the London Plan specified that up to one car space should be provided, and that if more had been proposed, officers would have advised that this was too many.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding design, officers detailed the materials that would be used, explained that a condition would be attached requiring sample materials to be agreed. Members were concerned that the drawings submitted were not clear enough in terms of how materials were to be used across the buildings and asked that a further condition for more detailed drawings be added and that this condition be shared with the Chair before the decision was issued. Members expressed that the plans/drawings provided were not clear and asked that they be better in future.

In response to Members' enquiries in respect of permitted development rights, officers replied that the full wording of a condition to restrict development rights had been included in the supplementary report circulated prior to the meeting, along with further written representations/objections. Members conveyed that it was helpful for these to be tabled on the night.

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

1. That the Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions. This includes the additional condition required for more detailed drawings on the use of materials.
2. That the Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

6 22/01267/FUL - 329 HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON, N9 7ET

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

In response to Members' questions relating to changes from/differences with the previously approved scheme, officers advised that there was an additional amount of commercial space on the ground floor. The number of units remained the same, but layout had been adjusted resulting in a loss of 2 bedrooms, but others were larger in size. The envelope/massing of the building was largely unchanged, there had been minor changes to windows and recesses to accommodate balconies, but there were no concerns of overlooking given the 25-metre distancing. The height of the building was unchanged; there had been a question of interpretation of the number of storeys among officers as to whether the basement should be included, and the elevation was for 3-5 storeys. There had been a widening of the entrance to the parking, which was accessed via Bridlington Road, resulting in an entrance to the ground floor flat being removed.

In response to Members' queries relating to permission caveats, officers responded that if granted, permission would require commencement within 3 years of the decision notice date, and there was a review mechanism, so that if the viability improved, the council would be able to claw back some of the profit which would be secured as a payment in lieu towards affordable housing elsewhere in the borough.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding design, officers replied that the application was submitted without having the elevations rendered. A condition would be included requiring details of the materials to be used to be submitted and these could be reviewed. Given the proposal was effectively amending the previous permission, the view was taken that it would be fair that the materials previously considered acceptable would continue to be so.

In response to Members' enquiries in respect of parking, officers advised that London Plan requirements were met. A survey had been undertaken using the Lambeth methodology industry standard, whereby space availability is looked at over two nights, which found a low stress in the area, with 50 to 60 spaces of on street availability. Around 32 cycle parking spaces were included, which was compliant with cycle parking standards and an improvement on the previous scheme.

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

1. The Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.
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 24/00570/HOU - 197 BURY STREET, N9 9JE

Karolina Grebowiec-Hall, Principal Planner, introduced the report and highlighted the key aspects of the application. It was stated that the application was before committee because it is an application by a Council Member, and the adopted scheme of delegation requires such applications to be considered at committee.

In response to Members' questions relating to the difference between parking on a driveway and the road, officers responded that accessing the drive may require reversing between two parked cars and crossing a pavement, which raised highway safety issues, particularly when the road was busy. The property was on a bend, on a bus route, close to a junction and any vehicle would be reversing out at a greater angle into the middle of the carriageway. When access on a classified road was assessed, if there is turning space on the site, this counts in an applications favour; in the case where vehicles have to reverse in/out on a road that carries high volumes of traffic, the guidance, which seeks to minimise the number of turning movements on classified roads, is less flexible. The hardstanding proposed for the driveway was also not deep enough to accommodate an average size vehicle, which would overhang the pavement, which may impact pedestrian access and require some manoeuvring.

In response to Members' queries relating to other driveways in the area having hardstanding to park on, officers replied that these were historic and had consent through the passage of time, with images showing many of these existed before 2008. This was older than current policy, which came in 2013 and set higher standards for highway safety, crossovers and driveways due to safety and flood risk concerns. As the existing dropped kerbs had been there for more than 10 years, they were immune from enforcement action. The planning inspector had reviewed the application when it went to appeal after being refused previously; they had supported officers' recommendation, and no significant changes had been made since.

The Chair proposed a countermotion, that the application be granted subject to conditions, due to the fact that manoeuvring would be required whether parked on a driveway or on the road, where parking was permitted, and neighbouring properties had dropped kerbs and hardstanding, despite having worse visibility. This was seconded by Cllr Anolue.

Officers reiterated that the matter had been before the planning inspector not long ago, that they upheld the council's decision to refuse permission; there had been no material change to the application since then, and the Committee did not present a planning rationale to justify granting consent.

Cllr Rye expressed that were the application submitted by a member of the public, it would have been refused by officers, and if the countermotion were agreed, it would look as though members were doing a favour for a fellow councillor, which would be totally unacceptable. The Chair said that if

someone could park in front of the premises for as long as they wished and receive no ticket, why not use the driveway.

The counterproposal, having been put to the vote; Members AGREED:

That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

8 24/00621/FUL - CHACE COMMUNITY SCHOOL, CHURCHBURY LANE, ENFIELD, EN1 3HQ

Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report and highlighted the key aspects of the application. Members were updated that the BREEAM sustainability rating was excellent rather than outstanding, and this would be the rating that officers would look to secure by amending condition 16. The applicant had also asked to be exempt of the requirement set out in the condition, to submit a post completion certificate confirming the BREEAM rating achieved, and asked that a similar approach to that applied to Chase Farm school be followed. This was because the cost of achieving certification for the applicant would be approximately £110,000, plus consultancy costs, and as this was a publicly funded project, delivering new school facilities, that they be required to comply with the excellent rating, but not evidence this through the BREEAM certification, post development.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding construction management, officers advised that wheel cleaning could be conditioned as part of this plan. It was not yet known which roads would be closed or when, but the applicant had agreed to provide leaflets to residents to keep them informed of any updates. There was a condition that required the delivery of open spaces within a certain time period of occupation of the buildings. Officers confirmed that the bridge connecting the EFAC building to the teaching block would be removed and replaced with windows, as there was no longer a need for the bridge. The development would achieve carbon savings of 100%, so was policy compliant.

In response to Members' enquiries in respect of transport, officers responded that the school capacity was not changing, but a travel plan condition could be added. If there were an existing plan, engagement could build on this, particularly with regards to the additional facilities which would be used outside of usual school hours.

In response to Members' questions relating to the community use agreement, officers replied that the condition recommended was for the submission of and adherence with this agreement, which provided a level of enforceability. If the school felt it was no longer viable to support this, they would be expected to go through an amendment process to the condition. Community use agreements usually came with some form of charging policy, for use/access by the community, to reflect maintenance costs.

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 17.9.2024

1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions, with the addition of a condition requiring the submission of a travel plan.
2. That the Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to finalise the wording of 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. It was confirmed that the provisional meeting date scheduled for Wednesday 9 October 2024, would not be used, and that the next meeting would take place on Tuesday 15 October 2024.

The Chair thanked Members and officers for their time and contributions, and the meeting ended at 20:57.