

## Decisions of the Strategic Planning Committee

9 September 2021

Members Present:-

Councillor Eva Greenspan (Chairman)  
Councillor John Marshall (Substitute)

Councillor Golnar Bokaei  
Councillor Thomas Smith  
Councillor Helene Richman  
Councillor Julian Teare  
Councillor Reuben Thompstone

Councillor Tim Roberts  
Councillor Anne Hutton  
Councillor Laurie Williams  
Councillor Nagus Narenthira  
Councillor Jess Brayne

Apologies for Absence  
Councillor Melvin Cohen

### 1. Minutes of the last meeting

The Chairman of the Strategic Planning Committee, Councillor Eva Greenspan welcomed all attendees to the meeting and noted the Covid-secure measures in place throughout the meeting.

The Committee agreed the following amendment to the minutes of the previous meeting, under agenda item 9 to read:

- *The Committee noted the material change in circumstances since the original decision notice.*
- *It heard that the Council had committed to take the site forward as an allocated site as part of the Council's Reg 19 Local Plan (Site No.45), with the appeal proposal corresponding with the proposed allocation;*
- *In addition, the site is included within the Council's Authorities Monitoring Report (AMR);*
- *The Committee voted 10 -1 to authorise Officers not to defend Reason for Refusal 1.*

**It was therefore RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2021, be agreed as a correct record as amended above.**

### 2. Absence of Members

Apologies were received from Councillor Melvin Cohen who was substituted by Councillor John Marshall.

### 3. Declarations of Members' disclosable pecuniary interests and other interests

Councillor Bokaei declared a pecuniary interest in relation to agenda item 6 (Douglas Bader Park Estate, London, NW9 - 20/6277/FUL) by virtue of owning a property opposite the application site and noted that she would not partake or vote on this item.

Councillor Sowerby declared an interest in relation to agenda item 6 (Douglas Bader Park Estate, London, NW9 - 20/6277/FUL) by virtue of having met with the developers and noted that he had not predetermined the matter and indicated that he would abstain from the vote.

#### **4. Report of the Monitoring Officer (if any)**

None.

#### **5. Addendum (if applicable)**

Items contained within the addendum would be dealt with under individual agenda items.

Councillor Farrier moved a motion which was seconded, to defer item 7 on the agenda to a later meeting due to insufficient notice to go through the addendum. Having put to the vote, the motion was declared lost.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For	4
Against	7
Abstentions	1

#### **6. Douglas Bader Park Estate, London, NW9 - 20/6277/FUL (Colindale)**

The Committee received the report.

Representations were heard from Corina Best (supporter), Charlotte Daus (objector), Councillor Gill Sargeant and the applicant.

Members had the opportunity to question all the speakers and Officers. Following discussion, the Chairman moved to vote on the Officer's recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For	5*
Against	5
Abstentions	3

\*The Chairman used her casting vote and voted for the recommendation.

**RESOLVED – That the application be approved as outlined in the Officer’s report.**

**7. B And Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES - 20/3564/OUT (Childs Hill)**

The Committee received the report, appendices and addendum.

Representations were heard from:

- Christopher Miller (objector)
- Ben Tansley (objector)
- Councillor Anne Clarke
- Councillor Alan Schneiderman
- Councillor Barry Rawlings
- Councillor Lia Colacicco (Mayor of LB Brent)
- Councillor Peter Zinkin
- Applicant

The Chairman noted the addition of an informative if the Committee were minded to approve the application, that in order to safeguard the railway cottages for the nearest building to the cottages not to be higher than three storages.

Members had the opportunity to question all the speakers and Officers. Following discussion, the Chairman moved to vote on the Officer’s recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the Officer’s report with the informative set out above.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For	6*
Against	6
Abstentions	0

\*The Chairman used her casting vote and voted for the recommendation.

**RESOLVED – That the application be approved as outlined in the Officer’s report.**

**8. Blocks 7- 9 Chandos Way And Blocks 1 To 6 Britten Close London NW11 7HW - 21/3001/PNV (Garden Suburb)**

The Committee received the report and addendum.

Representations were heard from Nick Jenkins (objector), Rodney Riley (objector) and Councillor Rohit Grover. The applicant was not in attendance.

Members had the opportunity to question all the speakers and Officers. Following discussion, the Chairman moved to vote on the Officer’s recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the Officer’s report.

Votes were recorded as follows:

For	1
Against	11
Abstentions	0

Councillor Marshall moved to a motion to refuse the application which was seconded. The Committee outlined the three reasons for refusal as:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the proposed use of materials, would have an unacceptable visual impact through the distortion and unbalancing effect of the external appearance of the existing buildings, contrary to paragraph 130 of the NPPF, Policy CS5 of Barnet's Core Strategy DPD (2012), Policy DM01 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document DPD (2012) and the guidance contained within Barnet's Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016).
2. The proposed development by reason of its siting over existing rooflights serving the top floor flats would lead to significant reduction of natural light being received to these flats and result in a substandard quality of accommodation giving rise to an unacceptable loss of existing residential amenities. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 130 of the NPPF, policies CS1, CS NPPF of the Adopted Core Strategy (2012, policies DM01 and DM02 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2012), the Residential Design Guidance SPD (2016) and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2016).
3. In the absence of a legal agreement securing appropriate mitigation by restricting future occupiers of the proposed development from obtaining parking permits within the Controlled Parking Zone, the proposed development would unacceptably increase on-street parking stress. The proposal would therefore not address the transport and highways impacts of the development, contrary to paragraph 110 of the NPPF, Policy CS9 of Barnet's Core Strategy DPD (2012), Policy DM17 of Barnet's Development Management Policies Document DPD (2012) and the Planning Obligations SPD (2013).

Votes were recorded as follows:

For (refusal)	10
Against	2
Abstentions	0

**RESOLVED – That the application be REFUSED for the reasons set out above.**

**9. Formal Adjoining Borough Consultation from LB of Enfield - Land Adjacent to Cockfosters Underground Station, Cockfosters Road, Barnet EN4 0DZ**

The Chairman used her discretion to extend the period for the transaction of business to three and a half hours after the start of the meeting.

The item was introduced and presented by the Planning Officer.

The Chairman noted that the item is for information and invited comments from Members.

Councillor Byers addressed the Committee and noted that the majority of residents are in Barnet. He raised concerns about the overdevelopment and the volume of objections received particularly in Enfield. Councillor Byers also noted the concerns regarding loss of parking, bulk, loss of amenity, likelihood of displaced residents, inability for public infrastructure to cope and school capacity. Furthermore, he noted the concerns about the incompatibility with two storey family homes particularly in Cockfosters.

Councillor Rawlings addressed the Committee and noted the issue with housing shortage and overdevelopment. He noted the impact on commuter parking and extra strain on local schools. He noted that for the impact to be investigated was not sufficient, that the application should be refused and that work not commence until the investigation about the impact was concluded.

**10. Any item(s) that the Chairman decides are urgent**

None.

The meeting finished at 9.25pm