#### **PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.9.2018**

# MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2018

## **COUNCILLORS**

PRESENT Mahmut Aksanoglu, Maria Alexandrou, Chris Bond, Sinan

Boztas, Elif Erbil, Gina Needs, Sabri Ozaydin, Michael Rye

OBE, Jim Steven and Mahtab Uddin

ABSENT Ahmet Hasan and George Savva MBE

**OFFICERS:** Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), David

Gittens (Planning Decisions Manager), Peter George (Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning), Dominic Millen (Regeneration & Environment) and Shikha Dasani (Regeneration Planning) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

Also Attending: Dennis Stacey (Chair, Conservation Advisory Group), Simon

Allen (Enfield Independent) and 11 members of the public,

applicant and agent representatives

# 753 WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Aksanoglu, Chair, welcomed all attendees.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Savva, Hasan and Dominic Millen (Group Leader Transportation).

## 754 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

NOTED there were no declarations of interest.

### 755

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, REGENERATION AND PLANNING (REPORT NO.74)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning.

## 756 ORDER OF THE AGENDA

#### **PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.9.2018**

**AGREED** to vary the order of the agenda to accommodate those in attendance. The minutes follow the order of the meeting.

## 757 17/04704/FUL - 301 THE RIDGEWAY, ENFIELD, EN2 8AL

### NOTED

- 1. The introduction by David Gittens, Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The deputation against the officers' recommendation of refusal from Darren Blackwell, the agent.
- 3. Members' debate, and questions responded to by officers.
- 4. The proposal that planning permission be refused was supported by the majority of the committee: 1 vote for and 9 abstentions.

**AGREED** that planning permission be refused.

## 758 18/03009/FUL - GENOTIN ROAD CAR PARK, GENOTIN ROAD, ENFIELD, EN1 2AG

### NOTED

- 1. There was a 5 minute adjournment of the meeting so as to allow committee members to view a scale model of the development.
- 2. The introduction by David Gittens, Planning Decisions Manager.
- 3. Request by officers for:
  - delegated authority to address/update planning conditions.
  - Confirmed resolution of SuDs (Sustainable Drainage System).
- 4. The statement by Dennis Stacey (Chair of the Conservation Advisory Group).
  - 5. Members raised concern regarding:
    - a. Compatibility of the proposals to the adopted Master Plan.
    - b. Lack of mixed use to the development.
    - c. Oversupply of car parking.
    - d. Future Management of car park.
    - e. Design Need for a Landmark building.
    - f. Use of existing site.
    - g. Impact on trees along southern boundary.
    - h. Number of outstanding points in the report.
    - i. Relationship to the conclusion of Place & Design Review Panel.
    - j. CCTV within the development.
  - 6. Members' debate, and questions responded to by officers.

#### **PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.9.2018**

- 7. The majority of the committee did not support the officers' recommendation with 3 votes for, 6 against and 1 abstention
- 8. A proposal to defer the decision on the application was agreed unanimously by the committee so that the above issues are addressed.

**AGREED** that a decision be deferred.

## 759 18/00633/RE4 - BROOMFIELD PARK, BROOMFIELD LANE, LONDON, N13 4HE

### NOTED

- 1. The introduction by David Gittens, Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. Officers reported the Archaeological condition.
- 3. Members' debate, and questions responded to by officers.
- 4. The majority of the committee did not support the officers' recommendation with 7 against and 3 abstentions.
- 5. A motion to defer was not agreed.
- 6. The proposal that planning permission be refused was supported by the majority of the committee: 2 votes for deferral and 8 against deferral

**AGREED** that planning permission be refused for the following reason:

The proposed wetlands area, given the absence of information to identify sufficient public benefit to offset the potential harm, the proposal, due to its size, skiting and form are considered to result in harm to the special character and appearance of the designated heritage assets of the Grade II listed Broomfield House and registered Broomfield Park. This would be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, Policy CP1 of the Local Plan Core Strategy and Policy DMD 44 of the Development Management Document.