

Decisions of the Strategic Planning Committee

22 February 2022

Members Present:-

Councillor Melvin Cohen (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Golnar Bokaei	Councillor Tim Roberts
Councillor Mark Shooter	Councillor Claire Farrier
Councillor Stephen Sowerby	Councillor Nagus Narenthira
Councillor Julian Teare	Councillor Jess Brayne
Councillor Reuben Thompstone	

Also in attendance

Councillor John Marshall (Substitute for Councillor Eva Greenspan)

Apologies for Absence

Councillor Eva Greenspan	Councillor Laurie Williams
--------------------------	----------------------------

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETINGS 10TH JANUARY 2022 & 12TH JANUARY 2022

The Vice-Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee, Councillor Melvin Cohen welcomed all attendees and chaired the meeting due to the absence of the Chairman. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted the Covid-secure measures in place throughout the meeting.

The Chairman also announced that this would be Councillor John Marshall's last planning committee meeting and thanked him for all the hardwork and dedication he had shown over his many years on the Committee.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on the 10th and 12th January be agreed as a correct record.

2. ABSENCE OF MEMBERS

Apologies were received from the Chairman, Councillor Eva Greenspan, who was substituted by Councillor John Marshall.

Apologies were received from Laurie Williams..

3. DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS AND OTHER INTERESTS

Councillor Julian Teare declared an interest in relation to item 7 of the agenda – Land formerly known as British Gas works, Albert Road, EN4 2TS, by virtue of sitting on the customer panel for one of the housing groups which were part owners of the site.

4. REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER (IF ANY)

None.

5. ADDENDUM (IF APPLICABLE)

Items contained within the addendum were dealt with under individual agenda items. The Committee noted the addendum to the Planning Agenda which was published and circulated prior to the meeting.

6. 21/3726/FUL - BARNET HOUSE, 1255 HIGH ROAD, N20 0EJ

The report was introduced and slides presented by the Planning Officer which were noted by the Committee in addition to the addendum.

Rt Hon. Theresa Villiers MP, Councillor Richard Cornelius, Councillor Thomas Smith and Fional Halstead spoke in objection to the application.

*Councillor Bokaei and Councillor Brayne joined the meeting part way through discussion of the item and therefore did not vote on this item.

Further to discussion of the item, the Chairman moved to vote to recommend approval of the planning application to the Planning Inspectorate. The votes were recorded as follows:

For (approval): 0

Against (approval): 9

Abstained: 0

RESOLVED that application not be recommended to the Planning Inspectorate for approval.

Members moved to vote on reasons for refusal and unanimously agreed to the following reason.

The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height, scale, massing and density would represent an over development of the site resulting in a discordant and visually obtrusive form of development that would demonstrably fail to respect the local context and established pattern of development, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, and the visual amenity of adjoining residential occupiers. The proposal would therefore not create a high-quality building, not constitute a sustainable form of development and would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, Policies D3, D4 and D9 of the London Plan 2021 and policies CS5, DM01 and DM05 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012.

Councillor Sowerby, seconded by Councillor Teare moved a motion to recommend a further reason for refusal to the Planning Inspectorate as follows;

The proposed development does not include a formal undertaking to meet the costs of provision of affordable housing, affordable workspace, carbon off-setting, highways mitigation, non-financial and financial skills, employment, enterprise and training

obligations, or street scene and street tree improvements. Moreover, the quantum of development and absence of appropriate secured mitigation would result in an undue strain being placed upon local health services. The proposal would therefore not address the impacts of the development, contrary to Policies CS5, CS9 and CS11 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), policies DM01, DM04, DM10 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies (adopted September 2012) and the Planning Obligations SPD (adopted April 2013), Paragraph 8 of the NPPF, Policy S2 of the London Plan 2021.

Votes on the motion to include the second reason for refusal outlined above were recorded as follows:

For: 6

Against: 3

Abstain: 0

RESOLVED that the second reason for refusal be included in the recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Chairman then moved to vote on the two reasons for refusal, as outlined above. Votes were recorded as follows:

For (Refusal): 9

Against (Refusal): 0

Abstain: 0

RESOLVED that the application be recommended for refusal to the Planning Inspectorate for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its excessive height, scale, massing and density would represent an over development of the site resulting in a discordant and visually obtrusive form of development that would demonstrably fail to respect the local context and established pattern of development, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area, and the visual amenity of adjoining residential occupiers. The proposal would therefore not create a high-quality building, not constitute a sustainable form of development and would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, Policies D3, D4 and D9 of the London Plan 2021 and policies CS5, DM01 and DM05 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies 2012'

2. The proposed development does not include a formal undertaking to meet the costs of provision of affordable housing, affordable workspace, carbon off-setting, highways mitigation, non-financial and financial skills, employment, enterprise and training obligations, or street scene and street tree improvements. Moreover, the quantum of development and absence of appropriate secured mitigation would result in an undue strain being placed upon local health services. The proposal would therefore not address the impacts of the development, contrary to Policies CS5, CS9 and CS11 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2012), policies DM01, DM04, DM10 and DM17 of the Development Management Policies (adopted September 2012) and the Planning Obligations SPD (adopted April 2013), Paragraph 8 of the NPPF, Policy S2 of the London Plan 2021.

7. **21/3676/FUL - LAND FORMELY KNOWN AS BRITISH GAS WORKS, ALBERT ROAD, NEW BARNET, EN4 9SH**

The report was introduced and slides presented by the Planning Officer which were noted by the Committee.

Rt Hon. Theresa Villiers MP, Councillor Nicole Richer, Councillor Felix Byers, Councillor Anne Clarke, Jon Dix and Nick Hufton spoke in objection to the application.

Mark Jackson, the agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee.

Further to discussion the Chairman moved to vote on the Officers recommendation to approve the application as set out in the report.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For: 1

Against: 9

Abstain: 1

RESOLVED that the application not be approved.

The Chairman, seconded by Councillor Teare, proposed the following reasons for refusal, which were unanimously agreed by the Committee.

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, massing and density would represent an over development of the site resulting in a visually obtrusive form of development that would fail to respect its local context and the pattern of development in the area, to such an extent that it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not constitute a sustainable form of development and would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF; Policies D3 & D4 of the London Plan (2021); Policies CS NPPF, CS5, DM01 and DM05 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012).

2 The proposed development by reason of its density, design and layout, would provide an unsatisfactory standard of residential accommodation due to the poor layout of some of the proposed flats, poor outlook and limited natural light. The proposal would therefore represent a poor form of development to the detriment of the amenity and living conditions of future occupiers. Therefore the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF; Policies D4 & D6 of the London Plan (2021); Policy CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); Policy DM01 and DM02 of the Development Management Policies (2012); the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016); and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2016).

3 In the absence of a Section 106 Agreement, the application does not include a formal undertaking to enable an amendment to the Traffic Regulations Order and to secure the planning obligations which are necessary to make the application acceptable. The application is therefore contrary to the NPPF; London Plan Policies S4, H4, H5, E11, S12, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, G6, G7 & DF1, Policies DM02, DM04, DM10, DM14, DM16, DM17; and Policies CS4, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS15 of the Development Management Policies (2012); Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); the Barnet Planning Obligations (adopted April 2013); Affordable Housing (adopted February 2007 and August 2010) Supplementary Planning Document; the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document on Delivering Skills, Employment and

Enterprise Training (SEET) (adopted October 2014); and the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing and Viability (2017).

The Chairman then moved to vote on the recommendation to refuse for the reasons outlined above. The votes were recorded as follows:

For (Refusal):10

Against (Refusal): 0

Abstained: 1

RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, massing and density would represent an over development of the site resulting in a visually obtrusive form of development that would fail to respect its local context and the pattern of development in the area, to such an extent that it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not constitute a sustainable form of development and would be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF; Policies D3 & D4 of the London Plan (2021); Policies CS NPPF, CS5, DM01 and DM05 of the Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2012).

2 The proposed development by reason of its density, design and layout, would provide an unsatisfactory standard of residential accommodation due to the poor layout of some of the proposed flats, inadequate separation distances, poor outlook and limited natural light. The proposal would therefore represent a poor form of development to the detriment of the amenity and living conditions of future occupiers. Therefore the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF; Policies D4 & D6 of the London Plan (2021); Policy CS5 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); Policy DM01 and DM02 of the Development Management Policies (2012); the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016); and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2016).

3 In the absence of a Section 106 Agreement, the application does not include a formal undertaking to enable an amendment to the Traffic Regulations Order and to secure the planning obligations which are necessary to make the application acceptable. The application is therefore contrary to the NPPF; London Plan Policies S4, H4, H5, E11, SI2, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, G6, G7 & DF1, Policies DM02, DM04, DM10, DM14, DM16, DM17; and Policies CS4, CS7, CS8, CS9, CS15 of the Development Management Policies (2012); Barnet Local Plan Core Strategy (2012); the Barnet Planning Obligations (adopted April 2013); Affordable Housing (adopted February 2007 and August 2010) Supplementary Planning Document; the Barnet Supplementary Planning Document on Delivering Skills, Employment and Enterprise Training (SEET) (adopted October 2014); and the Mayor's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing and Viability (2017).

8. 21/2407/RMA - DOLLIS VALLEY ESTATE (PHASES 4A, 4B & 5) BARNET EN5 2TS

The report was introduced and slides presented by the Planning Officer which were noted by the Committee in addition to the addendum.

Nigel Eade spoke in support of the application.
Libby Curley spoke in objection to the applicant.

Pearce Gunne-Jones, the agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee.

Further to discussion the Chairman moved to vote on the Officers recommendation to approve the application as set out in the report and addendum.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For: 11
Against: 0
Abstain: 0

RESOLVED that application be APPROVED and that the Committee grants delegated authority to the Service Director Planning and Building Control or Head of Strategic Planning to make any minor alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions as set out in this report and addendum provided this authority shall be exercised after consultation with the Chairman (or in his absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Committee (who may request that such alterations, additions or deletions be first approved by the Committee).

9. BROWNFIELD LAND REGISTER

The report was introduced by the Planning Officer which was noted by the Committee.

The Chairman moved to vote on the Officers recommendation to approve the updated 2021 Brownfield Land Register (BLR) for publication.

Members unanimously RESOLVED to APPROVE the publication of the updated 2021 Brownfield Land Register (BLR), as set out in Appendix A.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 9.29pm