

## Decisions of the Planning Committee

22 February 2017

Members Present:-

Councillor Melvin Cohen (Chairman)  
Councillor Wendy Prentice (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Maureen Braun  
Councillor Claire Farrier  
Councillor Eva Greenspan  
Councillor Agnes Slocombe  
Councillor Devra  
Kay (sub for Councillor Tim  
Roberts)

Councillor Stephen Sowerby  
Councillor Mark Shooter  
Councillor Laurie Williams  
Councillor Jim Tierney

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Tim Roberts

### CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained the arrangements for speaking, pointed out that the meeting was being filmed and changed the running order, as reflected in these minutes.

#### 1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2017, be agreed as a correct record.

#### 2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS

Councillor Tim Roberts, with Councillor Devra Kay as substitute.

#### 3. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS

| Councillor    | Item      | Interest  |
|---------------|-----------|---|
| Melvin Cohen  | Hasmonean | Non-pecuniary interest as former pupil of the school                                      |
| Mark Shooter  | Hasmonean | Non-pecuniary interest as former pupil of the school and brother a Governor at the school |
| Eva Greenspan | Hasmonean | Non-pecuniary interest as former Governor of the school – 20 years                        |

|                |                   |   |
|----------------|-------------------|---|
|                |                   | ago   |
| Claire Farrier | 12-18 High Street | Non-pecuniary interest as speakers are known to her |

**4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)**

None.

**5. ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)**

Items contained within the addendum were dealt with under individual planning applications.

**6. HASMONEAN**

The Committee received the report and addendum and noted that there had been one further letter of objection, post addendum.

Representations were heard from John Gillett, Anushka Levey, Councillor Duschinsky and the Applicant's agent.

**A vote was taken on the Officer's recommendation to REFUSE the application for the reasons detailed in the report:**

|                          |          |
|--------------------------|----------|
| <b>For (refusal)</b>     | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Against (refusal)</b> | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Abstained</b>         | <b>0</b> |

**It was moved by Councillor Cohen and seconded by Councillor Greenspan that the application be APPROVED for the following reasons:**

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** The application being one of strategic importance to London and also due to its location within the Metropolitan Green Belt must be referred to the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State. As such any resolution by the committee will be subject to no direction to call in the application being received from the Mayor of London and the Secretary of State.

**Recommendation 2:** Prior to submission to the mayor and Secretary of State the conditions, S106 Heads of Terms and any informative attached to the planning permission be agreed by the Head of Strategic Planning in consultation with the chairman.

**Recommendation 3:** That subject to Recommendations 1 and 2, the Head of Strategic Planning approve the final planning application reference 16/6662/FUL under delegated powers.

**Reasons for Approval**

- 1. Members are of the view that if the playing fields did not actually form part of the application site the impact on loss of publicly accessible open space would be lessened. This could be covered by an informative.**

2. Members are of the view that contrary to officer opinion there are indeed very special circumstances here to warrant exception to green belt policy.
  - (a) Operationally there is a need for the two schools to be conjoined the application is for one school.
  - (b) The applicants have made significant efforts to find other sites to accommodate both schools together over some 20 years without success.
3. The London Plan allows in Policy 7.18 that applicants can be required to improve the quality of a nearby area of open space at its own expense. Given the special circumstance of this proposal. LBB can require a significant monetary contribution to improve the quality of existing nearby open space.
4. London Plan allows in Policy 7.19 that applicants make appropriate compensation for the loss of biodiversity elsewhere in the Borough.
5. In relation to the trees taken out currently protected by a TPO members are of the view that the applicant can provide additional tree planting of suitably mature species on the application site.

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| For (approval)     | 7 |
| Against (approval) | 3 |
| Abstained          | 1 |

**RESOLVED** that the application be **APPROVED** for the reasons detailed above.

**THERE WAS A 5 MINUTE COMFORT BREAK AT 8.25PM, WITH THE MEETING RECONVENING AT 8.30PM**

## **7. NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH**

The Committee received the report and the addendum to the report.

Representations were heard from Gavin Waxkirsh, Karen Hatchett and Councillor John Hart.

The Committee voted on the Officer's recommendations to approve the report:

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| For (approval)     | 1 |
| Against (approval) | 8 |
| Abstained          | 2 |

It was moved by Councillor Sowerby and seconded by Councillor Braun that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development, by reason of its appearance, specifically the modern residential design and use of flats roofs, is out of character with the Mill Hill Conservation Area and has a negative impact when viewed from the Green Belt land to the north, contrary to policies 7.8 and 7.16 of the London Plan (2016), policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD

(adopted September 2012) and policies DM01, DM06 and DM15 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

- 2) The proposal will result in the loss of trees of special amenity value with associated loss of nature conservation value, contrary to policies 7.19 and 7.21 of the London Plan (2016), policies CS5 and CS7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy DPD (adopted September 2012) and policies DM01 and DM16 of the Development Management Policies DPD (adopted September 2012).

Councillor Tierney moved an amendment to Councillor Sowerby's motion to add lack of affordable housing to the reasons for refusal:

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>For (adding affordable housing to the list of reasons for refusal)</b>     | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Against (adding affordable housing to the list of reasons for refusal)</b> | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Abstained</b>  | <b>0</b> |

Councillor Tierney's amendment was **lost**.

The Committee proceeded to vote on Councillors Sowerby's motion to refuse the application for the reasons detailed above:

|                          |          |
|--------------------------|----------|
| <b>For (refusal)</b>     | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Against (refusal)</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Abstained</b>         | <b>0</b> |

**RESOLVED** that the application be **REFUSED** for the reasons detailed in Councillor Sowerby's motion.

**8. REFERRAL FROM THE FINCHLEY AND GOLDERS GREEN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 12-18 HIGH ROAD**

The Committee received the report and addendum and heard representations from Dr Lee Hoare, Mary Hogben and the Applicant's agent.

As the time was now 9.45pm the Chairman stated that he would be extending the finish time of the meeting to 10.30pm.

The Chairman moved to the vote on approving the application:

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| <b>For (approval)</b>     | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Against (approval)</b> | <b>5</b> |
| <b>Abstained</b>          | <b>1</b> |

**The Chairman used his casting vote, to vote in favour of approving the application.**

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved, subject to the conditions detailed in the report and subject to the addendum.

**9. PHASING COMMITTEE REPORT 16-7489**

The Committee received the report.

**RESOLVED that the application be unanimously approved, subject to the completion of a deed of variation (see the recommendation in the agenda) and the informatives in Appendix 2 of the report.**

**10. 2.4 AND 2.5 DECOUPLING**

The Committee received the report.

**RESOLVED that the application be unanimously approved.**

**11. TEMPELHOF BRIDGE RMA**

The Committee received the report and received a representation from Gina Emmanuel.

The Committee proceeded to vote on the application as follows:

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| <b>For (approval)</b>     | <b>6</b> |
| <b>Against (approval)</b> | <b>4</b> |
| <b>Abstained</b>          | <b>1</b> |

**RESOLVED that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives detailed in the report and the changes set out in the addendum.**

**12. ANY ITEM(S) THAT THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT**

None.

The meeting finished at 10.25pm