MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 14 AUGUST 2012

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Andreas Constantinides, Ali Bakir, Lee Chamberlain, Dogan

Delman, Patricia Ekechi, Ahmet Hasan, Ertan Hurer, Nneka Keazor, Paul McCannah, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott

and Toby Simon

ABSENT Ingrid Cranfield, Christiana During and George Savva MBE

OFFICERS: Bob Ayton (Schools Organisation & Development), Linda

Dalton (Legal Services Representative), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director, Planning & Environmental Protection), Andy Higham (Planning Decisions Manager), Steve Jaggard

(Traffic & Transportation) and Aled Richards (Head of Development Management) Metin Halil (Secretary) and

Penelope Williams (Secretary)

Also Attending: Approximately 40 members of the public, applicants, agents

and their representatives and observers

Ward Councillors: Councillor Achilleas Georgiou, Yasemin

Brett.

194 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.

195 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cranfield, Savva and During. The Chairman and Planning Committee members also wished Councillor During to get well soon, regarding her recovery in hospital.

196 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

- 1. Councillor McCannah declared a personal interest in application ref: P12-00654PLA as he lived in the vicinity of Heddon Court Parade.
- 2. Councillor Simon declared a personal interest in applications ref: P12-01798PLA Chesterfield Infant and Junior School, 2B Chesterfield Road,

Enfield, EN3 5BY and P12-01448PLA Bowes Primary School, Bowes Road, London, N11 2HL as his is wife was a school governor at both schools.

197 MINUTES OF PLANNING PANEL HELD ON MONDAY 9 JULY 2012

AGREED the minutes of the Planning Panel held on Monday 9 July 2012 as a correct record.

198

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE 24 JULY 2012

AGREED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 24 July 2012 be deferred to the next Planning Committee on 25 September 2012.

199

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (REPORT NO.62)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning and Environmental Protection (Report No.62).

200 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.

201 P12-00161PLA - 4, OLD PARK ROAD, LONDON, N13 4RE

- 1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application.
- 2. The dwelling had been previously enlarged following previous extensions.
- 3. The surrounding area was residential in character and was situated within the Lakes Conservation Area.
- 4. A previous application for conversion into 6 flats was refused on 20 January 2012.
- 5. The deputation of Mr Andy Charalambous, the applicant, including the following points:

- a. The application sought to make the best use of a large property, providing additional housing and maintaining a large 5 bed family unit.
- b. It addressed the concerns raised when the previous 6 unit application was refused.
- c. There would be no visible external changes to the property.
- d. It fitted in with neighbouring developments where flats have been approved. There were a total of 36 units directly adjacent to the property.
- e. It would improve the Conservation Area.
- f. There was no need to extend the width of the crossover. Four cars currently enter and exit daily.
- g. The house, as it is, was too big to sell or rent as one unit.
- h. Concern was raised about the continued reference to the Planning Inspectorate's previous judgement. The applicant felt that in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Code of Conduct, all cases should be judged on their own merits.
- i. If required, a condition could be imposed to ensure that a financial contribution to the cost of education in the area was made.
- Councillor Constantinides' support for the 5-bed unit which was of generous dimensions. Although there was a lack of amenity space for the flats they were very close to Broomfield Park.
- 7. Members' concerns in respect of lack of amenity space for two of the proposed flats, the width of the crossover and parking in front of the property, and that 33% of properties in the road had already been converted into flats. Members felt that there were too many issues with the application for deferral and suggested that a new application be submitted with better design proposals.
- 8. The Planning Decisions Manager advised that a distinction should be made between purpose built flats and conversions and the impact conversions had on the nature of the area. PINS decision needs to be taken into account.
- 9. The support of the majority of the committee for the officers' recommendation, with the Chairman of the Planning Committee abstaining.

AGREED that Planning Permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

202 P12-00654PLA - 2-4, HEDDON COURT PARADE, BARNET, EN4 0DB

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of applications P12-00654PLA and P12-00652PLA, which would be discussed together, but with a separate decision made on each application.
- 2. The deputation of Ms Jacky Van Der Waals, speaking on behalf of local residents, against the officers' recommendation, including the following points:
 - a. She lived in the vicinity of the application site.
 - b. There were already parking issues in the area and the application from Sainsbury's Supermarkets would attract even more cars and will change the nature of the area.
 - c. Concern about the loss of three shops which would be replaced by one large shop.
 - d. The application site road was not wide enough for lorries to drive through.
 - e. Additional noise would be an issue.
 - f. Concern about the opening hours of the Sainsbury's store.
- 3. The applicant, Mr Ben Borthwick (on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd) & Mr Tom Swift, Sainsbury's Transport Adviser, then spoke in response, including the following points:
 - a. The two applications to be determined were for a Sainsbury's convenience store which would be beneficial to the community.
 - b. The use of the store for retail does not require planning permission as the three units already have permission.
 - c. The store would only have limited stock 10% of a main store and was designed to appeal to customers on foot.
 - d. The extension planned was modest and only to be used for back up space of an appropriate scale and design.
 - e. The Planning Decisions Manager's recommendation was acceptable to Sainsbury's.
 - f. Sainsbury's had worked well with the Council's Highways Officers' as regards transport issues.
 - g. The three existing units would have had more deliveries.
 - h. As regards servicing of the units, the rear access to the units was adequate and would not be an issue. Only four deliveries a day were planned, taking up at the most 1 hour out of 24.
 - i. Parking anyone driving was less likely to use this type of store, so the parking issue was irrelevant.
 - j. These units were previously un-occupied.
- 4. The Planning Decisions Manager responded to Members' queries regarding traffic impact, that there would be no reason for an additional condition for parking facilities at the rear of the application site, as there was only a fire door located there and this would not accommodate enough room for deliveries.
- 5. The support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation of approval subject to conditions, with one vote against.

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

203

P12-00652PLA - 2-4, HEDDON COURT PARADE, BARNET, EN4 0DB

NOTED

- 1. Comments above also referred to this application.
- 2. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application.
- 3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

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

204

P12-01259PLA - PUBLIC FOOTPATH OUTSIDE CLOCKHOUSE PARADE MANSIONS, CORNER OF GREEN LANES & NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD, N13

- 1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application.
- 2. Receipt of one further letter of objection from a Town Planning Consultant. Concerns raised included non-compliance with planning policy, that the monopole would be higher than lampposts in the vicinity, the proximity of the monopole, the ancillary cabins size and siting which would be visually prominent and obtrusive to the appearance of the street scene, pavement obstruction by cabins, that it was against the North Circular Road Area Action Plan objectives and would have a negative impact on the appearance and character of the area.
- 3. The statement of Councillor Yasemin Brett, Bowes Ward Councillor, including the following points:
 - a. She spoke on behalf of residents in Bowes Ward and her fellow Ward Councillors.
 - b. She was grateful to planning officers for the recommendation for refusal.
 - c. The height of the monopole was in excess of other columns in the area.
 - d. The whole structure would take up pavement space.

- e. The fact that additional housing was being built in the area for families with young children and structures on the pavement make it difficult for the elderly and those with pushchairs.
- f. She supported the Planning Decisions Manager's recommendation of refusal.
- 4. The response of the Planning Decisions Manager to Members' concerns regarding:
 - location of the Monopole and that each case was judged on its own merits and this was a prominent position at a key junction in the Borough.
 - Health implications of telecommunications masts that the application meets the government guidance on communication masts.
- 5. The unanimous support of the Committee for the Officers' recommendation.

AGREED that planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

205 TP/11/1683 - 192 WHITTINGTON ROAD, LONDON N22 8YL

- The introduction of the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application. This application would normally have been determined under delegated authority, but Councillor Georgiou, Ward Councillor, had requested that it be determined at Planning Committee in response to the concerns of local residents.
- 2. The deputation of Ms Angela Kreeger and Mr Oliver Urquhart Irvine, speaking on behalf of local residents, including the following points:
 - a. No planning notice had been displayed in the area.
 - b. Only 20 notification letters had been sent out to residents, more residents should have been informed.
 - c. The retail unit was a launderette and had been closed for less than a year.
 - d. There were not enough GP surgeries in the area.
 - e. There were parking issues in the area as it was densely populated.
 - f. There was already a rubbish accumulation problem in the area and this conversion would add to the problem.
 - g. The character of the area had already been eroded and converting another shop into a flat would be detrimental.
 - h. Point 6.2.2 of the report was disputed. The character or appearance of the parade wouldn't be undermined by the loss of a retail unit.

- i. The committee should be encouraging retail units, but there had been no serious strategy to do this in the area.
- j. There was an error in the elevation plan shown in the report.
- k. There were plenty of conversions in the area already and it was requested that the application be refused.
- 3. The statement of Councillor Achilleas Georgiou, Bowes Ward Councillor, including the following points:
 - a. The application was against relevant policy as set out in the North Circular Road Area Action Plan, which intends to enhance the area and is at an advanced stage.
 - b. The retail unit was part of a small parade of shops which served the community well, adding character to the area.
 - c. The area was already an over concentrated dense area of housing.
 - d. The Bowes Ward needed commercial and retail properties with shops that served the community.
 - e. We should be encouraging what people want in the area and hear what residents are saying.
 - f. If the Council's policies for the North Circular Road Area Action Plan were referred to then this application would be rejected.
- 4. The response of Mr E.M. Pick, the applicant's agent, as a written statement read out by the Planning Decisions Manager, including the following points:
 - a. The conversion would not cause harm.
 - b. Continued vacancy would only create dereliction.
 - c. Similar conversions had already been approved close by, so a precedent had therefore been set.
 - d. The previous use would have generated much more rubbish than the use proposed.
 - e. The objection of 'overpopulation' was not a material planning consideration.
 - f. Approving the application would give a new lease of life to the premises enhancing the general street scene.
 - g. If the Planning Decisions Manager's recommendation was not accepted by the committee, the applicant would either leave the premises or pursue an appeal/cost award against the Council.
 - h. The Council's planning policy was to encourage re-use of vacant buildings, this was best done by allowing a change of use, leading to regeneration of these types of dis-used premises.
- 5. Councillor Prescott commented on Mr E.M.Pick's statement with the following points:
 - Rent reduction would encourage the letting of shops.
 - The area already had a high proportion of residential properties
 - The applicant would need to show gross negligence, by the Council, in order to gain a cost award from any appeal.

- 6. Members' concerns about the loss of a retail property and a lack of evidence that the retail is not required, the increase in the number of residential properties in the area and lack of facilities.
- 7. Planning Officer gave an update on the North Circular Road Area Action Plan and the implication of the Development Management Document (DMD) and commented on the risk of raising matters not previously considered.
- 8. The majority of the Committee did not support the officers' recommendation for approval subject to conditions and completion of section 106: 3 votes for, 8 against, and one abstention.
- Councillor Hurer's proposal that a decision be deferred to allow Members to consider the applicant's marketing evidence undertaken for the premises. In addition Officers to advise on how the proposal complies with the draft North Circular Road Area Action Plan (NCAAP) and draft Development Management Document (DMD).

AGREED to defer making a decision to enable officers to undertake further consideration regarding the loss of retail and the impact on the local centre. Agreed without objection.

206

P12-01321PLA - CHASE SIDE WORKS, CHELMSFORD ROAD, LONDON, N14 4JN

- The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager clarifying the site and application. The development which had been built differed slightly from the original plans which had an impact on other properties in Chelmsford Road.
- 2. Amendment to point 6.2.3, of the report, to read 'The realignment of the block in relation to the adjacent property, 138 Chelmsford Road would **not** materially alter the relationship and is considered acceptable'.
- 3. The receipt of an additional letter of objection raising the following points:
 - The development did not reflect the building line of the original houses.
 - The repositioning of flats further forward would result in a development totally out of line and keeping with the rest of the buildings.
 - The original distance across Chelmsford Road was just about sufficient. Anything less harms residential amenity.
 - The impact on properties on Chelmsford Road was accentuated by the presence of balconies which would lead to an invasion of privacy.

- The road was already narrow and building the block closer made the development appear overbearing.
- The repositioning of the access road so that it was now opposite the new properties increased the effect on residential amenity. The associated boundary treatment was unsightly.
- Development should be built in accordance to its original position and these alterations should not be accepted.
- Adequate consultation should have been carried out.
- 4. The deputation of Ms Jane Maggs, speaking on behalf of local residents against the recommendation, including the following points:
 - a. She was a resident of Chelmsford Road.
 - b. She raised concern about the changes to Block C of the development.
 - c. The building work being done in Block C had been stopped by the Council's planning enforcement team as it did not conform to original planning permission, showing a complete disregard to the planning process.
 - d. The close proximity of Block C to her house and others in the road will only be 17 metres and in places only 2.5 metres from the pavement.
 - e. The ground floor patios were very close to the road.
 - f. The balconies would lead to a loss of privacy and would create a noise nuisance, degrading the quality of life for neighbouring residents as well as being out of keeping with the surroundings, as it would be the only road in the vicinity with balconies.
 - g. Requested that Shanly homes review their plans again.
- 5. The response of Sam Tiffin of Shanly Homes, including the following points:
 - a. He thanked officers for their engagement and assistance.
 - b. He apologised to Councillors and residents for the illegal building works that took place.
 - c. The illegal activity was due to a naïve technical colleague who thought a change in the footprint would be acceptable.
 - d. The changes had not created any commercial gain in the development.
 - e. The close proximity of the development to neighbouring homes has had no great impact.
 - f. The siting of buildings has not resulted in shadowing of existing properties and has had no impact in access to natural light.
 - g. There is now a mechanism in place for any minor changes, which will lead to the change being consulted on and recorded.
- 6. The response of the Planning Decisions Manager to Members' concerns regarding the balconies, invasion of privacy and the illegal works.
- 7. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 10 votes for and 2 against.

AGREED that subject to a deed of variation of the section 106 agreement, the Head of Development Management/Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant planning permission for a minor material amendment subject to conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

207 P12-01274PLA - FORESTERS HALL, 44, CHASE SIDE, ENFIELD, EN2 6NF

- 1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application for a variation of TP/11/1562; condition 09.
- 2. A petition was received from local residents opposing the application.
- 3. The deputation of Mr Nigel Amos, on behalf of local residents, including the following points:
 - a. The application was detrimental to local residents as it would cause disturbance in a quiet residential conservation area.
 - b. The outdoor garden was very close to residential properties.
 - c. Local residents would be unable to use their gardens, due to noise disturbance from children's play.
 - d. The applicant had had an open day in 2011 to discuss her application with local residents but objections had been ignored.
 - e. The letters of support received did not include any addresses.
 - f. The application suggested that no more than 9 children would use the garden at any one time, but the condition did not limit the number of children.
 - g. Concern that the Council would not be able to police or enforce the condition.
 - h. That there was a large out building in the applicant's garden that does not have planning permission.
 - i. Concern regarding increased traffic from parents, dropping and picking up children as well as from staff.
 - j. If this application was approved more planning applications would be received to enable even greater use of the garden.
- 4. The deputation of Mrs Kaye Wildman, the applicant, in response including the following points:
 - a. Noted the late deputation of Mr Nigel Amos and residents, but agreed to speak in response, allowing the deputation so as not to be obstructive.
 - b. The children attending the nursery were aged between 10 months 4 years old and should have the right to representation.
 - c. That she had been saddened by the local residents' response to her application.

- d. No complaints about noise had been received at her other nursery in 17 years
- e. The children would be missing out if they are not allowed to play outside. Obesity was a huge problem in Enfield.
- f. That she had documents from residents supporting the application.
- g. Noise levels from 9 children playing outside would not add to noise levels already coming from nearby Chase Side Primary School.
- h. Children have a right to play outside. They would be well supervised.
- i. An invite was extended to Members to visit the nursery and observe the impact of outdoor play.
- j. The nursery was only opened 8 June 2012 and the uptake has been very good.
- 5. The Planning Decisions Manager responded to Members' queries regarding the monitoring of noise levels.
- 6. Members' debate and discussion regarding the original planning permission, given approval in March 2012, with the condition that the garden could not be used for recreation by the children.
- 7. The motion was supported by 6 votes, and there were 6 votes against. The Chairman gave his casting vote for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report and the amended condition below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Amended Condition

The outdoor play space as shown on the approved 'Location Plan' shall only be used for children's play by no more than 9 children at any one time and in accordance with the schedule attached between the hours of 10:00 to 11:30 and 14:30 to 16:00, Monday to Fridays only, excluding Bank Holidays. The use of the garden for children's play shall take place for a temporary period of one year from the date of the Decision Notice. Once this time has elapsed, the outdoor play space shall no longer be used for children's play unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To enable the Local Planning Authority to assess the potential noise levels generated by the proposed use of the garden and safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.

208 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 (10pm) be suspended for a period of 30 minutes to enable the business on the agenda to be completed.

209 P12-01390PLA - 1 & 3 PITFIELD WAY, ENFIELD, EN3 5BY

- 1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the site and application.
- 2. The applicant has agreed to fund traffic measurement measures to secure the one way movement of vehicles along Pitfield Way (no turning into Pitfield Way from Hertford Road).
- 3. The deputation of Ms Sylvia Hart, Chair of Governors of Durants School, including the following points:
 - a. As the Headteacher of Durants School, Mr P. De Rosa couldn't attend the meeting, Sylvia Hart spoke in his place against the Planning Decisions Manager's recommendation.
 - b. The points raised by Mr De Rosa's letter of objection were documented within the report (pages 128/9).
 - c. The development would add to traffic problems, as many children attending Durants school have to come by car.
 - d. All the pupils attending Durants School are Autistic. Autism is a severe disability with the inability to express emotions. Most of the pupils have severe autism and can be aggressive.
 - e. This development would impact on the well being of these autistic children. The children attending the temporary class may cause distress to the children with autism, which could lead to inappropriate behaviour by the autistic children.
 - f. The development site was so close to Durants school, that it would add to the noise in terms of noise from the children causing severe anxiety to the autistic children.
 - g. She supported all the points made by Mr P. De Rosa in his two objection letters.
 - h. This development would have a major negative impact on the pupils at Durants'.
- 4. Ms Shelley Smith, the applicant's agent spoke in response, including the following points:
 - a. The Enfield Heights Free School was proposed by the Centre for British Teachers (CfBT), local teachers and parents.
 - b. The main development proposal would be for a primary free school for 175 pupils but would require a separate planning application.
 - c. The Headteacher of Enfield Heights Free School wrote to Durants School on the 5 March 2012, submitting a questionnaire and inviting them to a meeting to discuss concerns raised

- including noise, close proximity of the free school and overlooking.
- d. To address the concerns raised, extra fencing and landscaping would be provided.
- e. Play times would be staggered so as to reduce noise.
- f. The Durant school children normally arrived by bus, limiting additional traffic.
- g. The proposed development was a small school in a densely populated area, so buses would be used as the main mode of transport or on foot.
- h. Enfield Heights Free School wished to work closely with Durants School so as not to compromise each respective school.
- i. The free school children would gain benefits from the contact with the autistic children.
- 5. Bob Ayton, the Schools' Organisation and Development Officer, made the following points:
 - Enfield Council had not been involved in the development of this new school.
 - There were clear issues with the proposed siting of the development so close to Durants School. But this had to be balanced against the rise in demand for school places which showed no sign of ceasing.
 - Enfield would welcome the additional places, but Members' should keep in mind the issues raised when the full application was received.
 - The increase in the number of places at Chesterfields would be provided by a one-off temporary class and was some distance away from this site.
- 6. The Planning Decisions Manager responded to Members' queries regarding the proposed scheme for a full school. Some Members expressed reservations about the suitability of the site while accepting that the current proposal was acceptable.
- 7. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 9 votes for and 1 against with one abstention. Councillor Bakir did not vote.

AGREED upon completion of the Section 106 Agreement, the Head of Development Services/Planning Decisions Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report, with an amendment and additional conditions (set out below) for reasons set out in the report.

Additional Conditions:

Restriction of Permitted Development

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or any amending Order, no buildings or extensions to buildings shall be erected without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the likely impact of any potential expansion of the temporary accommodation approved on the health of retained trees.

Restriction of Pupil Numbers

Pupil numbers at the temporary school hereby approved shall not exceed 25 pupils without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the likely impact of any increase in pupil numbers on traffic generation and the free flow and safety of traffic, including pedestrian traffic, on the adjoining highways. Received Recommendation: Amended Decision to include condition on details of means of enclosure.

Action: Decision not to be issued until applicant has submitted an Equalities Impact Assessment, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

210 P12-00924PLA - COMMERCIAL PREMISES, STOCKINGSWATER LANE, ENFIELD, EN3 7PH

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The changes to conditions concerning bio-diversity and energy sustainability.
- 3. 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 as amended at the meeting, for the reasons set out in the report.

211

P12-01070PLA - CHICKEN SHED THEATRE, 290, CHASE SIDE, LONDON, N14 4PE

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The application decision had been deferred from the Planning Committee meeting held on 24th July 2012, to enable receipt of

information to confirm the number of pupils attending the premises. A total of 140 students would be attending, a net increase of eight.

3. 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.

212

P12 - 01210PLA - ST ANDREWS CHURCH OF ENGLAND SCHOOL, 116, CHURCHBURY LANE, ENFIELD, EN1 3UL

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The proposed restriction in the hours of use.
- 3. 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 the additional condition below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Additional Condition

Restricting hours of use from 8am to 6pm.

213

P12-01211PLA - ST MARYS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, DURANTS ROAD, ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX, EN3 7DE

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The correction to paragraph 7.1, line 2 "would **not** detract".
- 3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officer's recommendation.

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

211

P12-01256PLA - ELDON INFANT SCHOOL, ELDON ROAD, LONDON, N9 8LG

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

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

215

P12- 01430LDC - WORKSHOP AND STORE, ADJACENT TO NORTH LODGE, WHITEWEBBS ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 9HS

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The application is for a lawful development certificate.
- 3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that the Lawful Development Certificate be granted for the reason set out in the report.

216

P12-01392HER - BOWES PRIMARY SCHOOL, BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N11 2HL

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of applications P12-01392HER and P12-01448PLA, which would be discussed together, but with a separate decision made on each application.
- 2. The school was a listed building and planning permission was being sought for internal structures, to convert the basement so as to enable the creation of additional reception class places.
- 3. An additional letter of objection raising concerns over the effect of traffic pollution on children and the need for an environmental report before development was implemented.
- 4. Advice from officers that the Council had already installed an Air Quality Monitoring Station at the school, and since 2003 the level of particulates contained within diesel pollution had not exceeded the Air Quality objective levels.

5. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that subject to referral to the Secretary of State and no objection being raised, planning permission be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

217

P12-01448PLA - BOWES PRIMARY SCHOOL, BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N11 2HL

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that subject to referral to the Secretary of State and no objection being raised, planning permission be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

218

P12-01729PLA - HAZELWOOD INFANT AND JUNIOR, HAZELWOOD LANE, LONDON, N13 5HE

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. Two letters of objection from neighbouring occupier regarding visual presence of building and impact on residential amenity. In addition, concerns around inconsiderate parking by parents which would be exacerbated by the proposal.
- 3. The additional condition regarding more planting to act as a screen as set out below.
- 4. 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 the additional condition below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Additional Condition: Details of landscaping

Within one month of the date of the Decision Notice, details of boundary planting to the rear of the building approved, adjacent to the common boundary with No.128 Riverway, shall be provided to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The approved planting shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following the approval of the details. Any planting that dies or becomes diseased within 5 years shall be replaced with plantings of a similar species and size in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: To help provide some additional screening of the building in the interest of visual amenity.

219

P12-01798PLA - CHESTERFIELD INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOL, 2B, CHESTERFIELD ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 6BG

NOTED

- 1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
- 2. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation

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

220

PLANNING PANELS

AGREED that the committee would delegate to the Chair and Opposition Lead the decision to agree membership of planning panels.

221

APPEAL INFORMATION

NOTED the information on Town Planning application appeals received from 05/07/12 to 20/07/12 summarised in tables.