

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15.10.2024

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2024

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Mahym Bedekova (Vice Chair), Josh Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Nelly Gyosheva, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven and Suna Hurman

OFFICERS: Karen Page (Head of Planning and Building Control), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), John Neal (Senior Planning Officer), Joseph Aggar (Planning Decisions Manager), Michael Kennedy (Design and Heritage Manager), Mike Hoyland (Senior Transport Planner), Julie Thornton (Legal Adviser) and Harry Blake-Herbert (Governance Officer)

Also Attending: Applicant and agent representatives, deputies, ward councillors and members of the public

1 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

In the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair chaired and welcomed everyone to the meeting. It was agreed that Cllr Kate Anolue would act as Vice-Chair for the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Sinan Boztas (Chair) and Bektas Ozer, who was substituted by Cllr Suna Hurman. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Josh Abey, who would be unable to ask questions and vote on item 4, application reference 23/03806/FUL, having arrived after discussions on this item had begun.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3 REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL

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

4 23/03806/FUL - 23 CRESCENT EAST BARNET EN4 0EY

John Neal, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report and highlighted the key aspects of the application.

A deputation was received from Robert Wilson, Chairman of Hadley Wood Association and local resident, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15.10.2024

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

The agent, Joe Henry, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments, advising that the property presented itself to the street as a dwelling house and was similar to other conversions/ new builds on the road, so there would not be a harmful change in character. The building footprint would cover 48% of the site and the rooms towards the side and obscure glazed so did not need to receive the same level of light. The previous application was greater in size, covering two sites and removed views between the properties. The application was not in a flood zone, the site was on a slope and the accommodation at lower ground floor level was not in a basement but had direct access to the rear; officers had suggested conditions to address any potential issues. The proposal would not result in overlooking as there was a 16.8 metre minimum distance to the rear boundary and 45 metres to the nearest property behind.

In response to Members' queries relating to transport, officers responded that the maximum provision based on the relevant plans was for 10.5 spaces (1.5 per unit). The application had been submitted and assessed on the basis of 1 space per unit; there had been no objection to this and it was deemed acceptable. A theme of the Hadley Wood Neighbourhood Plan was not to take up too much landscaping space by providing additional parking. The site was not within a CPZ or on a classified road, so there would not be a significant impact from any additional vehicles parking on the street.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding policy, officers clarified that the proposal did breach the policy requirement that there should not be more than 1 in 5 new builds or house conversions in a row, however there would be less than 20% (14.8%) of these within a 200-metre radius of the site. The application also needed to be assessed with regard to the housing need and tilted planning balance, and officers had considered it acceptable.

In response to Members' enquiries in respect of the size of the development, officers advised that the building was larger than what was currently there, but the bulk/ massing was towards the rear, so not visible from the street or harming the character of the area, thus was deemed appropriate. The angles of properties and shielding from existing planting reduced the view of the building from neighbours. There was no harm to the conservation area, subtle variations in elevation were acceptable and the perception of height would be different from the street.

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

1. That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.
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.

5 24/00045/FUL - 38 HOUNSDEN ROAD, LONDON, N21 1LT

Joseph Aggar, Planning Decisions Manager, introduced the report and highlighted the key aspects of the application. Members were updated that 19 objections had been received in relation to the application and 1 further objection was received on 15 October. The nature of these objections were summarised accurately in the report. Condition 14 was proposed to be updated, to remove permitted development rights for Article 3 Schedule 2 Part 1 Class F, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 in addition to the other uses already included.

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

A deputation was received from Cllr Stephanos Ioannou, Southgate Ward Councillor, who spoke against officers' recommendations.

The agent, Peter Case, spoke in response.

Officers responded to comments, advising that the building line of the main 2 storey element would be in-line with the adjoining occupier, with a 3-metre single storey projection beyond and a 45-degree line assessment had found it would result in no harm in terms of daylight/sunlight.

In response to Members' questions relating to transport, officers responded that one space would be provided per dwelling, which matched policy and demand in the area and had been deemed acceptable. There was an availability of on-street parking, as evidenced by a survey submitted with the application, which showed the level of parking to be less than 50% occupied over two nights. There was an existing access, which would not be widened to Houndsden Road, and one new access was being created to provide an additional space to Stone Hall Road, but this would not result in a significant highway impact. The safety impacts of crossovers and on street parking, as well as the need to balance parking with landscaping and refuse space were explained. Whilst changes could be negotiated, as the scheme was acceptable in policy terms, these could not be insisted on. If there were ongoing issues with Houndsden Road, the Traffic Safety Team could respond to requests to address this. Visibility splays were conditioned and the technical guidance for crossovers on the approach to a junction was 10 metres; the new access on the non-classified Stone Hall Road more than met this. Officers confirmed that the previous application had been refused under delegated authority due to the overprovision of parking and inadequacy of visibility splays to Stone Hall Road, which had now been resolved.

In response to Members' queries relating to trees, officers replied that one fruit tree in the middle of the site, of no particular merit would be removed. There was a condition for the surrounding trees to be retained and a landscaping condition which asked for details of replacement trees.

In response to Members' questions and comments regarding development, officers advised that under the previous application, it wasn't considered that the subdivision of the site would result in an uncharacteristic overdevelopment. Within the immediate vicinity was another site which had been developed; the proposal maintained gaps between and included similar features of surrounding properties, so it was not considered an over intensification.

In response to Members' enquiries in respect of the impact on a neighbour's amenity, officers responded amenity had not previously formed a reason for refusal. There would be additional units, residents and vantage points from the rear of the properties, but the separation between the proposal and neighbouring property was about 20 metres and at an angle. Trees were being maintained which would provide screening and there was already a degree of mutual overlooking, which was common in the vicinity, so it was not considered there would be significant enough adverse impacts to warrant refusal. Sheds were proposed in the back garden, but these were a common ancillary feature for such a site and would not represent an over intensification within the vicinity of the neighbour. A car space would be located towards the rear but not directly behind the neighbour's garden and there was a condition that may require it being moved away from the fence to accommodate visibility splays, but it would not be so significant as to disrupt the neighbour's amenity.

Cllr Rye proposed a countermotion, that the application be deferred in order for officers to work with the applicant to resolve the provision of traffic and parking, specifically to try to increase the amount of off-street parking space and ensure the rear car parking space was not adjacent to a neighbour's rear garden and detrimental to the amenity of their property. This was seconded by Cllr Chamberlain.

The counterproposal, having been put to the vote; was not supported by a majority of the committee.

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

1. The Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions, including the amendment to condition 14 highlighted at the meeting.
2. The Planning Decisions Manager be granted delegated authority to agree the final wording of the conditions to cover the matters in the Recommendation section of this report.

6 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 Tuesday 5 November 2024, would be used as the next meeting.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 15.10.2024

The Chair thanked Members and officers for their time and contributions, and the meeting ended at 20:42.

This page is intentionally left blank