

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 2 FEBRUARY 2021**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Maria Alexandrou, Kate Anolue, Mahym Bedekova, Sinan Boztas, Elif Erbil, Ahmet Hasan, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, Hass Yusuf, Susan Erbil, Doug Taylor and Daniel Anderson

**ABSENT**

**OFFICERS:** Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Dominic Millen (Group Leader Transportation), David Gittens (Planning Decisions Manager), Sarah Cary (Executive Director Place), Joanne Drew (Director of Housing and Regeneration), Catriona McFarlane (Legal Representative), Ed Richards (Regeneration Housing Programme Director), Joseph Aggar (Principal Planner) and Kate Perry (Principal Planning Officer) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Members of the public, applicant and agent representatives were able to observe the meeting live online.

**1**

**WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED

1. Councillor Boztas (Chair) welcomed all attendees to the meeting, which was being broadcast live online. Committee members confirmed their presence and that they were able to hear and see the proceedings.
2. There were no apologies for absence.

**2**

**DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

NOTED

1. There were no declarations of interest.

**3**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 5  
JANUARY 2021**

NOTED

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 2.2.2021

1. The minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 5 January 2021 were agreed.
2. In response to Councillor Alexandrou's query, Andy Higham (Head of Development Control) advised that the recording of the meeting was reviewed, and confirmed the minuted reasons for refusal that Members had voted on in respect of the Arnos Grove application.

### 4

#### REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING

RECEIVED the report of the Head of Planning.

### 5

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

**AGREED** to vary the order of the agenda. The minutes follow the order of the meeting.

### 6

#### 20/03404/FUL - CHASE FARM HOSPITAL, THE RIDGEWAY, EN2 8JL

NOTED

1. The introduction by Kate Perry, Principal Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals.
2. Since the publication of the committee report, a SUDs strategy had also been provided and agreed by the Council's SUDs Officer. It was noted that if Members were minded to approve the application there would no longer be a need for pre-commencement condition 16 which relates to the provision of a SUDs strategy.
3. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers.
4. Members' concerns and comments including the following:
  - Details of drop off and pick up areas for the school students on the temporary site.
  - Whether the site was adequately remediated for contamination.
  - Whether the play areas for students were safe.
  - The provision of electric charging points was insufficient for the temporary site.
  - The removal of low-quality trees should be replaced using the green strategy by planting good quality trees along with temporary plants.
1. The support of the majority of the committee for the officers' recommendation with 11 votes for. Councillor Hasan was unable to vote as he had technical issues with his device and only heard part of the application and debate.

**AGREED** that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

### 7

#### 20/03070/FUL - FALCON ROAD SPUR, EN3 4LX

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 2.2.2021

NOTED

1. The introduction by Sharon Davidson, Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
2. The application was brought back to committee following deferral at 15th December 2020 meeting to allow consultation with Ward Councillors to be undertaken.
3. The Regeneration Team undertook direct consultation with Ward Councillors, with 2 meetings taking place. It is understood Councillors wanted reassurance that thorough consideration had been given to how the medical centre, youth centre and community centre would operate, and that the proposal would not lead to a situation where any of the functions couldn't operate properly.
4. The statement of Councillor Ayfer Orhan, Ponders End Ward Councillor.
5. The response of Greg Blaquiere (Agent) on behalf of the applicant.
6. Members lengthy debate and questions responded to by Officer'.
7. Officers' noted the committee's concerns and comments:
  - Traffic concerns in the Spur and Du Jardin Mews.
  - Inadequate consultation with residents with only 47 letters sent to surrounding residents.
  - Previous planning permission granted allocated parking spaces and no proviso now to re-visit parking allocations.
  - Why was planning permission granted to Medical Centre as its use-age was not appropriate for this site.
  - Request by the committee to officers to look at parking spaces for medical centre on the roadside (Woodhall Road) close to the surgery.
8. Motion to defer the application by Councillor Taylor, seconded by Councillor Rye. To explore the possibility of alternative additional parking spaces in other locations including Woodhall Road to ensure that the Medical Centre can operate.
9. The unanimous support of the committee to defer the application for the reasons given.

**AGREED** that a decision on the application be deferred to allow officers to explore if there were any alternative parking facilities that could be utilised to support the medical practice, either in total or by minimising the use of the approved community uses spaces.

**8**

**20/02461/CAAD - OAKWOOD LODGE, AVENUE ROAD, LONDON, N14 4DE (THE "SITE")**

NOTED

1. The introduction by Joseph McKee, Senior Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals.
2. Two applications made under Section 17 of the Land Compensation Act 1961 and seek a Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development (CAAD) to establish what planning permissions, if any, would have been

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 2.2.2021

- granted had the Site not been acquired compulsorily by the Council in 2017.
3. The first proposal (referred to as **Application A**) is for the conversion of the roof space of each block to create 4 x 1-bedroom units (2x1 bedroom units in each roof space). To facilitate the conversion, associated works are proposed in the form of hip to gable roof extensions, the construction of front and rear dormers at roof level, plus the reconfiguration of the external staircase, to facilitate access to the upper floor flats.
  4. The second proposal (referred to as **Application B**) seeks to establish if planning permission would have been granted for the alteration of the roof space of each block to create 2 x 2-bedroom units (1 unit in each roof space). To facilitate the conversion, the proposal includes the constructions of dormers, reconfiguration of the access stairs internally and inclusion of rooflights.
  5. Both Applications A and B would have resulted in poor quality accommodation for future occupiers. In addition, the alterations and extension to the roof of the blocks in Application A would have resulted in a dominant and incongruous form of development, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, in overall terms, the proposals would not have met the social and environmental objectives of sustainable development, having regard to the NPPF. The proposals, would therefore, have been considered to be unacceptable.
  6. Members debate and questions responded to by officers.
  7. Officers' noted the committee's concerns and comments.
  8. During the debate, it was **AGREED** that the rules of procedure within the Council's Constitution relating to the time meetings should end (10pm) be suspended for a period of 15 minutes to enable the business of the agenda to be completed.
  9. Members first vote was for the committee to confirm whether they agreed with Officers' that planning permission would not have been granted for the development comprising 4 x 1 bedroom self-contained flats in the roof space or 2 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats in the roof space.
  10. The unanimous support of the committee for the officers' recommendation regarding applications A & B, that planning permission would not have been granted.
  11. Members second vote regarding the third recommendation; would the committee have granted planning permission for a 1 bedroom flat in each block and if planning permission was granted then the committee are agreeing with the overall recommendation to grant a positive Certificate. If the committee would not have granted planning permission for 2 x 1 bedroom flats then the committee are voting against the officers' recommendation.
  12. The majority of the committee did not support the 3<sup>rd</sup> option and overall officer recommendation: 11 votes for and 1 abstention.
  13. Members third vote was for the reasons for refusal which were for the appearance and design of the development, car parking affecting the surrounding area and concern around the 2 x 1 -bedroom units not meeting housing needs at that time.
  14. The unanimous support of the committee for refusal and for the reasons given.

**AGREED** that planning permission would have been refused for the proposals A and B in accordance with the recommendations in the report. Members resolved that planning permission would also have been refused for a proposal for 2x1 bed units in the roof space based on design/appearance, lack of adequate parking on site and potential of overspill, and inappropriate mix of smaller units.

**9**

**FUTURE MEETING DATES**

NOTED

1. The next meeting date of the planning committee will be as follows:
  - 23 February 2021