

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 23 APRIL 2013**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Andreas Constantinides, Ali Bakir, Lee Chamberlain, Ingrid Cranfield, Dogan Delman, Christiana During, Patricia Ekechi, Ahmet Hasan, Ertan Hurer, Nneka Keazor, Paul McCannah, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott, George Savva MBE and Toby Simon

**ABSENT**

**OFFICERS:** Bob Ayton (Schools Organisation & Development), Linda Dalton (Legal Services), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director, Planning, Highways & Transportation), Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Ray Reilly (Principal Planning Officer), Steve Jaggard (Traffic & Transportation), Paul Walker (Assistant Director, Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management) and Sujata Majumdar (S106 Project Manager) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Approximately 50 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives  
Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration  
Tony Dey. Vice Chairman, Conservation Advisory Group  
Ward Councillors: Achilleas Georgiou and Henry Lamprecht

**914**

**WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, and the Legal Services representative read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

**915**

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED that apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Cranfield, Prescott and Savva.

**916**

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

NOTED

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

1. Councillor Cranfield declared a non pecuniary interest in application ref P13-00338LBE – Eldon Infant School, Eldon Road, London, N9 8LG, as she was a governor of the school which was located in her ward.

**917**

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 4 MARCH 2013**

**AGREED** the minutes of the Special Planning Committee held on Monday 4 March 2013 as a correct record.

**918**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 26 MARCH 2013**

**AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 26 March 2013 as a correct record.

**919**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING PANEL HELD ON 28 FEBRUARY 2013 - NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD APPLICATIONS**

RECEIVED the minutes of the Planning Panel held on Thursday 28 February 2013 regarding application refs P12-03179PLA, P12-03177PLA, P12-02858PLA and P12-02859PLA.

**920**

**REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (REPORT NO. 212)**

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning and Environmental Protection (Report No.212).

**921**

**ORDER OF AGENDA**

**AGREED** that the order of the agenda be varied to accommodate members of the public in attendance at the meeting. The minutes follow the order of the meeting.

**922**

**P12-03177PLA - 1-23, TELFORD ROAD, 233-237 BOWES ROAD, (KNOWN AS SITE 14), LONDON, N11 2RA**

NOTED

1. Councillor Prescott arrived at the meeting at this point.
2. The introduction of the Head of Development Management, clarifying the proposals and officers' conclusions.

### PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

3. Four residents who had previously objected had written to re-affirm objections.
4. A further objection submitted on behalf of residents of Hastings Road, Bexhill Road and Pevensey Avenue.
5. A summary was given of objections received.
6. Clarification that reference to Broomfield Road Residents Association should be Broomfield Home Owners and Residents Association.
7. Councillor Cranfield arrived, but having missed the beginning of the item, would not be permitted to vote on this application.
8. Clarifications / corrections to the report:
  - Para 2.1 should read: 9x3 and 6x4 bed houses as opposed to 13x3 bed and 2x4 bed.
  - Para 7.4.9 should read *it is considered the scheme does **not** create any significant residential amenity concern.*
  - 7.6.10 was a typographical error and should be disregarded.
9. An update from Sustainable Design Officer was provided on sustainability issues as referred to in para 7.11 – confirming that the proposals are broadly acceptable and considers there are no reasons why the scheme can not achieve the required Code Level 4. There are a number of green incentives included as part of the scheme such as green roofs and solar panels which are encouraged. Overall at this stage the information presented is acceptable, however a number of conditions have been proposed to ensure the site achieves the optimum requirements but requests delegated authority to review these conditions to ensure the objective is achieved.
10. The deputation of Caroline Chenier, local resident, including the following points:
  - a. It would be impossible for the short roads of Bexhill, Hastings and Pevensey to cope with such a dense population increase, being in a cul-de-sac formation and landlocked by the Telford Road section of the A406.
  - b. Site 14 would introduce a minimum of 240 residents, with additional residents to come from Sites 15a, b and c, and a private development, which would create an untenable burden on the current community.
  - c. The meeting should be deferred as there had been insufficient time to read the report, ask questions under the Freedom of Information Act, review the information and formulate objections.
  - d. They had wished to request the Process Documents.
  - e. The high level of public objection was shown at the Planning Panel and the petition of 507 signatures.
11. The deputation of John Andrews, local resident, including the following points:

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

- a. He would be directly affected by the development, with overlooking directly from a large number of balconies, and noise from residents.
  - b. The density, scale and height did not have regard to the context of houses at the rear.
  - c. There would not be a buffer as the building did not exist yet.
  - d. Notting Hill tenants did not feel able to make objections.
  - e. A decision should be delayed for issues to be looked at again.
12. The statement of Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Bowes Ward councillor) including:
- a. He was speaking on behalf of his constituents and others.
  - b. His objections focused on parking and traffic issues.
  - b. With this development, other Notting Hill development, and the private development, nearly 100 homes would be added in this small area.
  - c. The parking ratio for this site would be 0.59, whereas the site opposite would have a ratio of 0.73. In the area currently the parking ratio was 0.83. It was unfair that new residents would receive substantially less parking space than current provision. There was leeway to have this amended. The London Plan specified a range. Notting Hill should come up with new plans which recognised the parking ratio in the area.
13. The statement of Councillor Henry Lamprecht (Southgate Green Ward councillor) including:
- a. He echoed everything said by Councillor Georgiou.
  - b. He had requested a separate meeting to listen to all the arguments.
  - c. There would be large numbers of new residents coming into the area where schools and doctors surgeries were already full.
  - d. School children would have to cross the North Circular Road.
  - e. There had already been 52 accidents since works to the A406.
  - f. Notting Hill should be asked to reconsider and come back with smaller and more sustainable proposals.
  - g. The applications were being rushed through so Notting Hill could gain government grants.
14. The response of Ken Barnett, Project Director, Notting Hill Housing, including:
- a. He had been working with the Council since 2009.
  - b. This site had been identified for residential development in the pre-submission draft Area Action Plan (AAP), which identified the need to build 1300 new homes in the wider area. This application contributed to meeting this need.
  - c. The application would optimise provision of homes for sale/rent to local people at an affordable level. 40% of homes would be affordable, split between rental and shared ownership.
  - d. There were currently 13 properties on site, overlooked by the new bridge, in a poor condition, unviable and undesirable for refurbishment.
  - e. Public exhibitions and consultations were held in 2011 and 2012, and there had been ongoing consultation. Significant changes had been incorporated into the proposals as a result of feedback received.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

- f. More intensive use of previously developed land was encouraged across London at densities of up to 700hrph. The density in this development was 547hrph.
  - g. The position and height would have a minimal impact on current homes due to distances and the site gradient.
  - h. There would be 15 new family homes provided.
  - i. Traffic and parking had been discussed with Council and TfL officers. Increase in car trips would be minimal and there would be minimal impact. Car ownership was reducing. 39% of local households did not own a car or have access to a car. 37 parking spaces would be provided for 62 units, including one for each of the 15 family units. The site across the road had 20 family units, which explained the difference in parking ratio at that site.
  - j. Parking was in line with that at the recently approved Ladderswood development.
  - k. There would be S106 contributions to health and education.
  - l. Regeneration would be provided to an area which had been subject to decades of blight.
15. The Head of Development Management advised (i) all information held on a planning application was publicly available to be viewed at any time and as such was exempt from Freedom of Information regulations; and (ii) infrastructure requirements were identified in the AAP and this development would make a contribution to those.
16. The Schools Organisation & Development Officer advised that Garfield School was expanding as part of the Primary Expansion Programme, and a further phase of school expansions was being worked on as projections indicated higher numbers of pupils in coming years. Barnet and Haringey Councils were also looking at potential expansions of nearby schools in their respective areas. These issues would be discussed when all three councils met in the near future.
17. The Traffic & Transportation Officer confirmed that parking provision differences between sites related to the housing mix and that dedicated parking would be provided for family units. Parking levels were consistent with London Plan ranges. A downside of providing more parking spaces would be the generation of more trips to and from the site. He considered that the affect on local roads would be a not unacceptably high impact.
18. Members' lengthy debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
- a. The position of the children's play area was clarified.
  - b. The levels of amenity space were clarified.
  - c. Distancing was clarified by officers and considered adequate.
  - d. Concerns that the living environment would be unsatisfactory for new residents, and there would be unacceptable harm to the existing community.
  - e. There was a need to provide affordable housing for local people.
  - f. S106 contributions were confirmed.
  - g. Concerns that details on pollution were sketchy.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

- h. This was a high density area. Such development could be sustainable.
- i. Ongoing concerns regarding traffic and parking; housing density; and massing and scale raised.
- j. This would be a vast improvement on current accommodation, which was not viable to bring back into use.

19. The Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration's advice in respect of the Council's Core Strategy, and declining car ownership data.
20. The support of a majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 7 votes for and 6 votes against.

**AGREED** that subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement, the Planning Decisions Manager / Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report and delegated authority to review conditions relating to sustainable design and construction, for the reasons set out in the report.

**923**

**P12-03179PLA - 244-262, BOWES ROAD, AND, LAND REAR OF 194-242, BOWES ROAD, (KNOWN AS SITE 11), LONDON, N11 2RA**

NOTED

1. The introduction of the Head of Development Management, clarifying the proposals and officers' conclusions.
2. Four residents who had previously objected had written to re-affirm objections.
3. Clarification that reference to Broomfield Road Residents Association should be Broomfield Home Owners and Residents Association.
4. Clarifications / corrections to the report:
  - Para 7.6.18 under the first table it should read: "the proposed development would result in the parking provision range in Table 1."
  - Para 7.6.19 error reference source not found should read Table 1.
  - Para 7.6.21 error reference source not found should read Table 1 and Table 2.
5. An update from the Sustainable Design Officer as referred to in para 7.11 – confirms that the proposals are broadly acceptable and considers there are no reasons why the scheme can not achieve the required Code Level 4. There are a number of green incentives included as part of the scheme such as green roofs and solar panels which are encouraged. Overall at this stage the information presented is acceptable, however a number of conditions have been proposed to ensure the site achieves the optimum requirements but requests delegated authority to review these conditions to ensure the objective is achieved.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

6. Confirmation of amounts for legal agreement.
7. Amendment to Condition 33b – should read “the D1/D2 commercial unit” as opposed to premises.
8. The deputation of Nikki Salih, Chair of Ritz Parade Traders Association, including the following points:
  - a. The proposed development would be too high.
  - b. The mews houses would have no windows at the back.
  - c. The shared pathway for traffic and people caused great concerns.
  - d. The proposed access road was dangerous.
  - e. It was questioned how local schools would cope.
  - f. Concerns regarding lack of green space, travel plan, bin space, and cycle storage.
  - g. The strength of opposition was evidenced by the Planning Panel turnout, petition and banner. A clear message had been sent, but the community was not being listened to.
9. The deputation of Peter Travis (Headteacher) / Adam Beamish, on behalf of Broomfield School, including the following points:
  - a. This was the wrong development and would not enhance Broomfield School. The mews houses in particular would have a damaging effect.
  - b. A narrow but pleasant quiet playground area with plenty of trees and plants would be made claustrophobic and dark by the mews element along the boundary which would be very close and block the sunlight.
  - c. The condition in respect of the landscaping buffer would not work and there seemed to be reliance on negotiations between the school and developer.
10. The statement of Councillor Achilleas Georgiou (Bowes Ward councillor) including:
  - a. The design should be in keeping with the street scene. This development was hugely different from nearby 1930s residential homes.
  - b. Parking space provision to serve the flats was inadequate. For the flatted element, the parking ratio would not meet minimum requirements.
11. The response of Ken Barnett, Project Director, Notting Hill Housing, including:
  - a. This site had also been identified for residential development in the pre-submission draft Area Action Plan (AAP).
  - b. Together with Site 14 it was part of a complimentary cohesive approach for the area.
  - c. The current 10 houses adjacent to the footbridge were in poor condition and overlooked. The rear alleyway suffered flytipping and gave poor quality access to refurbished houses.
  - d. Considerable revisions had been made to original proposals in response to feedback.
  - e. It was considered that objections in respect of traffic, parking, and pressure on services had been addressed, and officers were satisfied with the proposals.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

- f. Appropriate uses for the community space were being identified, to address local need with allocated parking.
  - g. A further study had been done to address Broomfield School's concerns. Sunlight in the playground area would be above the minimum level deemed acceptable. The dominance, bulk and impact on the school had been considered.
  - h. A 'home zone' had been incorporated in many developments, was sustainable and child friendly and reduced the dominance of cars.
12. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
- a. Members' concerns regarding amenity space provision, design not in keeping with the street scene, and impact on Broomfield School.
  - b. The levels of amenity space were clarified.
  - c. Sunlight levels to the playground area were confirmed.
  - d. Confirmation of construction access and acceptability of flood risk.
  - e. Advice in respect of widening of the existing access, and accessibility for refuse vehicles.
  - f. Confirmation that the access served the development only and not the school.
  - g. Comments that this would be a positive gateway into the borough.
13. The support of a majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 8 votes for and 6 votes against.

**AGREED** that subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement, the Planning Decisions Manager / Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report amendment above and delegated authority to review conditions relating to sustainable design and construction, for the reasons set out in the report.

**924**

**P13-00338LBE - ELDON INFANT SCHOOL, ELDON ROAD, LONDON, N9 8LG**

NOTED

1. The meeting was subject to a brief adjournment before consideration of this application.
2. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager clarifying the proposals.
3. Receipt of one further letter of objection raising concerns including increased traffic from parents causing obstruction, pollution and noise, and increased litter caused by children and parents.
4. The deputation of Ros Bacal, including the following points:
  - a. She was speaking on behalf of other residents of Woodlands Road as well as herself.



## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

- b. In 2003 assurance had been given that pedestrian access would never be approved. Condition 18 was put in place to safeguard residential amenities of properties along Woodlands Road.
  - c. Residents feared parking restrictions, and pollution, and parents parking with little regard for residents.
  - d. She would be directly affected if carers or dial-a-ride transport were unable to park outside her home.
  - e. Pollution from engines ticking over would adversely affect her health.
  - f. There would be increased traffic with parents using this road.
  - g. Concerns about the affect on the housing market in the road.
  - h. She would like to view access requirements in full before the decision and to know about proposed zigzag markings and to have it noted that her disabled parking bay was not fully marked out.
5. The response of Julie Messer, Executive Headteacher, Eldon Infant School, on behalf of the governing body, including the following points:
- a. In response to local authority requests in respect of the need for primary pupil places, the school agreed to expand to a yearly intake of 150 pupils and to double the nursery intake to 120 pupils.
  - b. Access to the early years school building was through the main playground, and during the lunchtime swap-over infant pupils would also be in the playground with the potential they may run through as the gate was opened. The problem would be exacerbated by the increased number of nursery pupils. The solution would be access via Woodlands Road through a clearly defined entrance for early years classes.
  - c. The school would have a much safer operating system. As well as improving safeguarding, this would also spread the footfall.
  - d. Staff were deployed to all entrances to assist safe passage and the Woodlands Road entrance would be included in this system.
6. **SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL CONSTITUTION – TIME OF MEETING AGREED** that the rules of procedure within the Council’s Constitution relating to the time meetings should end (10:00pm) be suspended for a period of 60 minutes to enable the business on the agenda to be completed.
7. Members’ debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
- a. Amendment to the recommendation to respond to issues raised by the depute and the requirement for an impact assessment and appropriate mitigation with a final decision delegated to officers, in liaison with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Opposition Lead Member if necessary.
  - b. Clarification of policies relating to disabled bays, and to zigzag markings, and the Traffic & Transportation officer’s assurance there would be minimal impact to the depute’s disabled bay.
  - c. Discussion that approval for a two year temporary period would be appropriate, to enable the impact to be assessed.
8. The support of the Committee for the officers’ amended recommendation, with one abstention.

**AGREED** that Members resolved, following the undertaking of an Equalities Impact Assessment to assess the implications of imposition of parking restrictions to the site entrance required in connection with the opening up of the access for general pedestrian use, to grant officers delegated authority to grant planning permission for a temporary period of 2 years.

**925**

**P12-02750PLA - 62, VERA AVENUE, LONDON, N21 1RL**

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposal and recent planning history.
2. Grange Park Residents Association supported the recommendation for refusal. They commented that the size and design of the current property complemented its surroundings whereas the proposed development did not and would stand out.
3. Receipt of a further neighbour objection, received between publication of March and April meeting agendas, on the grounds that the development was out of keeping with the other properties in Vera Avenue, and the development would damage the integrity of the local environment and allow a property very different in style to the surrounding 1920s/30s dwellings.
4. The deputation of Murat Aydemir, the applicant, including the following points:
  - a. A supporting statement had been distributed to all Members ahead of the consideration of the item.
  - b. The area had a mixture of houses, with the majority having been altered. The features of no.56 a few doors away were highlighted.
  - c. This was not a Conservation Area. The building was not listed.
  - d. The current scheme had been changed since the original refusal in the light of the Planning Inspector's comments, and there had been further consultation with neighbours.
  - e. The third floor element had been scrapped, with no balconies or windows in the roof level to front elevation.
  - f. This was a sustainable design which included solar panels, rainwater harvesting, and ground source heat pumps, triple glazing and more.
  - g. The rear glass structure had been kinked back to deal with light issues, and dropped below the fence line.
5. Councillor Savva arrived, but having missed the beginning of the item, would not be permitted to vote on this application.
6. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
  - a. Members' comments that the street scene was mixed and there was no uniformity between nos 56 – 64. It was considered this design would not

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

impact on the street scene as there was so much variation in size, design and mass, and the footprint of no.56 was bigger than this.

- b. Acknowledgement that the decision was finely balanced.
  - c. Confirmation of the grouping considered by the Planning Inspector, and that the appeal decision was a material consideration.
  - d. Reason 1 implied that a modern building would not be acceptable, which did not necessarily reflect Members' views.
  - e. Concerns in respect of the size of the building on the site, terracing effect, and overlooking from the rear.
7. The majority of the Committee did not support the officers' recommendation: 5 votes for and 8 votes against with 1 abstention.
  8. Members had raised sufficient reasons for granting planning permission during their debate, and officers would impose standard conditions to an approval.
  9. The support of the majority of the Committee for the proposal that planning permission be granted: 10 votes for and 4 votes against.

**AGREED** that Members resolved to grant planning permission considering that;

1. The street scene comprises a mix of properties of differing designs and size and that whilst the dwelling the subject of the application was modern in design, given its size and scale, and the fact that gaps would remain either side of the dwelling, it would not harm the appearance of the street scene.
2. The proposed dwelling having regard to structures that presently exist on site and the relationship with the adjoining properties, the fact that overlooking of gardens presently occurs from existing first floor windows of adjacent properties would not unduly harm the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.

Members granted delegated authority for officers to grant planning permission subject to appropriate conditions, including a restriction on permitted development rights. Officers to draft conditions and reasons for granting and these to be cleared by Chairman and Opposition Lead Member.

**926**

**P13-00558PLA - 18, THE GREEN, LONDON, N21 1AY**

NOTED

1. Councillor Savva received advice from the Legal Services representative that he had no disclosable interest in the application.
2. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposal, and that conditions were recommended to cover the hours of opening and to ensure the mixed use of the premises and not solely take-away.
3. Advice in respect of refusal of planning permission in 2008 for the introduction of a take-away use at nos 32-34 The Green. Traffic and

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

Transportation had raised no objections to the current application. It was acknowledged that the highway conditions immediately outside the premises differed due to proximity to the roundabout.

4. Receipt of six further letters of objection raising concerns including:
  - The occupier has continued to trade illegally without the proper consent, this shows a lack of respect for the area and the Council.
  - Just because the premises are operating does not mean permission should be granted.
  - There will be ramifications of opening up the floodgates to allow take away operators into an area of special protection.
  - Impact on traffic flow.
  - Litter, this has increased substantially with rubbish regularly waiting collection to the front of the business as there is no rear access, and take away litter on the roads.
  - Bags left out ripped open by foxes and litter strewn across the Green.
  - Noise and disturbance.
  - The floor area is clearly leaning towards take away with the whole ground floor servicing the take away trade.
  - Any permission should be tailored to the applicant only.
  - A condition should ensure the operator walks the area at least twice a day to collect litter.
  - Sandam restaurant 5 doors away was denied an A5 takeaway when they applied correctly.
  - A take-away would change the character of the Green.
5. Revision of Condition 2.
6. Requirement for a litter strategy and provision of an additional bin.
7. Recommendation that planning permission be temporary for one year so that use could be monitored.
8. The deputation of Brian Foyle on behalf of Winchmore Hill Residents' Association, including the following points:
  - a. There had been disregard for the local community, and for planning requirements over the last ten years.
  - b. This application would probably not have been made without residents having brought concerns to the Council's attention.
  - c. The use would lead to more traffic and short term parking in obstructive places, and food may be eaten on the Green causing litter disposal issues, especially in the summer weather.
  - d. The majority of tables were hidden in the basement and the ground floor was dominated by a service counter typical of a take-away.
  - e. Fears that nearby Sandam restaurant would introduce casual take-away food on the back of this application.
  - f. Fears that the restaurant could be sold to one of the national multiples and this would destroy the character of the Green.
9. The response of Matthew Wheeler, the agent, including:

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

- a. There would be no alterations to the façade.
  - b. The restaurant already had a working flue.
  - c. The restaurant already had a refuse agreement with the Environment Agency to remove all waste products.
  - d. The majority of tenants and other businesses on the Green were in favour of this proposal.
  - e. If the application was not granted it would greatly affect use of the building and the viability of the business.
10. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
- a. Wish to support local business, but concerns in relation to litter and potential for a different take-away operator to acquire the premises.
  - b. Discussion of an appropriate limit for temporary permission to allow time for the business to establish and impacts to be monitored.
  - c. Members' request that after the temporary period, the matter be referred back to Planning Committee.
11. The unanimous support of the Committee for the amended recommendation, with one abstention.

**AGREED** that the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report and additional conditions below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Application for renewal to be taken back to Committee.

Additional Conditions:

1. Detailed plan defining the extent of the area allocated to takeaway use to be submitted within 1 month of the date of decision.
2. Revision to Condition 2 – The premises shall be used for a mix A3/A5 (restaurant/hot food takeaway) within Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as Amended) and shall not be used solely as a hot food takeaway nor the area given over to takeaway service increased from that shown on the plans approved pursuant to condition (x) above unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Details to be submitted of a strategy to deal with litter, the provision of an additional refuse bin and the timescale for provision.
4. Temporary permission (18 months).

**927**

**TP/10/0783 - HOLLY HILL FARM, 305, THE RIDGEWAY, ENFIELD, EN2 8AN**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

**928**

**P13-00435PLA - LAND SOUTH SIDE OF WHITEWEBBS LANE,  
INCORPORATING ROLEMILL SPORTS GROUND AND LAND REAR OF  
MYDDLETON HOUSE, BULLS CROSS, ENFIELD, EN2 9HA**

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. The Biodiversity Officer has confirmed that subject to a condition to ensure that reptile migration strategy is implemented there should be no constraints to development, as on completion of the project the application site will continue to be suitable reptile habitat. He also recommends that details of the landscaping scheme for the site be submitted that planting comprise native species of regional provenance, due to the relationship of the site to a native woodland.
3. Two additional conditions, in relation to reptile mitigation strategy, and details of landscaping.
4. Tony Dey, Vice Chairman, Conservation Advisory Group, highlighted the comments of the group in para 4.1.3, and that Keepers Cottage was affected by every development at this site and should not be dismissed as in para 6.3.1.
5. Confirmation that no additional traffic would be generated by this application.
6. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report and additional conditions below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Additional conditions in summary:

1. No development hereby permitted shall commence until a reptile mitigation strategy has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall thereafter be implemented as approved. Should the applicant conclude that reptiles are not present on the site and that reptile mitigation is not necessary that applicant shall submit a report which details how this conclusion has been reached and the report shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that reptiles, which are a priority species, as per the NPPF, are protected in line with Core Policy CP36 of Enfield's Core Strategy.

2. No development shall commence until a details landscaping scheme has been submitted. Planting to comprise native species of regional provenance.

**929**

**P13-00551PLA - CRAIG PARK YOUTH CENTRE, LAWRENCE ROAD, LONDON, N18 2HN**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**930**

**P13-00552PLA - LODGE DRIVE CAR PARK, LODGE DRIVE, LONDON, N13 5LB**

NOTED

1. Receipt of one letter of objection raising the following issues:
  - The sewerage network and ground disruption works to the existing car park, if any, should be identified and implemented prior to the proposed building being installed.
  - Works necessary to provide broadband connection to the intranet, and ground works disruption to the car park, if any, should be identified and implemented prior to installation of the proposed building.
  - Works necessary to provide and install CCTV should be identified before the building is occupied.
  - Works necessary to provide additional lighting both immediately in and around the outside of the proposed unit and the pedestrian approaches should be implemented before occupation.
  - The area around Lodge Drive has proven to be a magnet for anti social behaviour and users of the proposed library must have confidence in their safety during operational hours. The design and access statement fail to identify that the pedestrian route from Green Lanes is lengthy and has a blind spot – assurance could be given if additional lighting, safety mirror and CCTV were provided.
  - The installation of the building will cause dark shadows in and around the building.
  - Proposal will result in an increase in mobility scooters and pushchairs accessing the site. Secure and covered facilities should be provided for them.
  - The proposed building utilises 2 of the existing 7 disabled bays. 3 bays should be reserved for library users and further additional bays marked as disabled in the larger car park.
  - The routing of waste collection needs to be checked.
  - The use of a portable building will generally mean the use of a crane lift and a methodology document should be required by condition.
  - The transfer of documents and equipment from the existing building requires manual handling. An assessment is needed and the vehicle access necessary within the car park. It may be necessary to provide a

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

level access vehicular transport platform height through a specialised opening in the building.

2. Additional conditions reported:
  - (1) Details of the refuse storage facilities.
  - (2) Details of external lighting to the building.
3. Members' suggestion of signposting from Green Lanes to assist access.
4. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, additional conditions above, plus details of signage to mark route to the building from Green Lanes, for the reasons set out in the report.

**931**

**P13-00581PLA - RUSSETT HOUSE SCHOOL, 11, AUTUMN CLOSE, ENFIELD, EN1 4JA**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that planning permission be deemed to be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to the condition set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

**932**

**P13-00316PLA - 1-16 EAGLE COURT, 35, SNELLS PARK, LONDON, N18 2TF**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**933**

**P13-00317PLA - 101-132, SNELLS PARK, LONDON, N18 2SY**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be



**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013**

granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**934**

**P13-00318PLA - 1-32, TRINITY COURT, 33, SNELLS PARK, LONDON, N18 2TE**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**935**

**P13-00590PLA - 1-9A, ANGLESEY ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 4HY**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General) Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**936**

**P13-00591PLA - 11-15A, ANGLESEY ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 4HY**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General) Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**937**

**P13-00592PLA - 67-105, BOWOOD ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 7LL**

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**938**

**P13-00615LBE - 161-167, GREEN STREET, ENFIELD, EN3 7LB**

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 23.4.2013

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**939**

### **SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS - MONITORING INFORMATION**

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director (Regeneration, Planning and Programme Management) (Report no 215).

NOTED

1. Members noted the contents of the report and its Annexes.
2. Members agreed to receive six monthly monitoring information regarding S106 agreements reported to Planning Committee in May and November each year from now on.
3. Members were invited to direct any queries to Paul Walker individually.

**940**

### **PLANNING PANEL**

**AGREED**

1. That a Planning Panel meeting be arranged in respect of the planning application for the Carterhatch depot site.
2. The membership of the Panel be agreed with the Chairman and Opposition Lead Member once a meeting date had been identified.

**941**

### **END OF MUNICIPAL YEAR**

NOTED

1. This was the final meeting of the Planning Committee in the 2012/13 municipal year.
2. Thanks were recorded to all Members for their participation on the Committee this year.