

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING PANEL  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 2013**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Ertan Hurer, Ingrid Cranfield, Ahmet Hasan, Martin Prescott and George Savva MBE

**ABSENT**

**OFFICERS:** Andy Higham (Planning Decisions Manager), Ray Reilly (Principal Planning Officer), David B Taylor (Traffic and Transportation) and Neeru Kareer (Planning Policy Officer) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Applicant (Notting Hill Home Ownership) Representatives:  
Ken Barnett – Notting Hill Housing  
Karen Jones - CgMs  
Martin Hughes - Polity  
Ewout Vandeweghe – Stock Woolstencroft  
JMP transport consultant representative  
MP for Enfield Southgate : David Burrowes  
Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration  
Ward Councillors:  
Councillor Alan Barker (Southgate Green Ward Councillor)  
Councillors Yasemin Brett and Alan Sitkin (Bowes Ward Councillors)  
And approximately 200 members of the public / interested parties

**1  
OPENING**

1. Councillor Hurer as Chairman welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the Panel Members, the Council officers and the applicant's representatives.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the applications and for the applicants, officers and Panel Members to listen to all the comments.
3. A decision on the applications would be made by the full Planning Committee at forthcoming committee meetings.

**2  
OFFICERS' SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING ISSUES**

NOTED

1. Andy Higham, Planning Decisions Manager, gave a brief outline of the proposals and the planning issues.
2. This meeting was a further opportunity to express opinions on the proposed developments and was part of the ongoing consultation process. A large number of emails and comments had been received to date. Comments made at this meeting would be noted and would also form part of the overall assessment. A copy of the notes would be appended to the reports to Planning Committee. Residents would be notified of those Planning Committee meeting dates in advance.
3. The sites were within the area of the North Circular Road Area Action Plan (AAP). The Local Plan and the Core Strategy had identified this wider area as suitable for 1300 homes to be provided (including Ladderswood Estate).
4. Key planning issues raised were: height, design, internal standards, relationship to neighbouring properties, environmental impact, local infrastructure, access, traffic generation, parking, and sustainability.
5. If people had further questions and comments these would be continued to be accepted up until Friday 8 March so that they could be taken into account and reported as part of the main assessment of the applications.

**3**

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT / AGENT**

NOTED

1. Ken Barnett, Project Manager, Notting Hill Housing Trust (NHHT) gave an introduction of the proposals:
  - He had been working with NHHT since April 2009, when discussions started with Enfield Council and other parties, and as they had moved forward in taking over properties from Transport for London (TfL).
  - There were a number of properties involved on a number of sites and there were four phases to the development. The first phase was refurbishment, which had now been completed for 257 homes, many of which were now occupied. The second phase covered smaller residential development sites: around 55 new homes had a resolution to grant consent. The third phase covered the proposals under discussion at this meeting – the larger residential development sites. The fourth phase would cover locations in Green Lanes / Ritz Parade, where there was more work to be done, taking the lead from the AAP, for mixed uses: no planning applications had been made yet on these.
  - In relation to consultation, NHHT had been holding regular meetings with officers, local councillors and various stakeholders.

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

- There had been public consultation from July 2011 regarding Sites 11 and 14. A good response had been received and a lot of changes had been made in revising the proposals.
  - There had been public consultation from March 2012 regarding Site 6, and adjustments had been made to the submitted application. Subsequently, a number of points were being re-looked at, and the Planning Department would be re-consulting on Site 6 proposals.
  - The original aim in the Core Strategy was 2000 new homes, but a total of 1300 was included in the emerging AAP, and NHHT were providing some of that housing need.
  - NHHT were aware of concerns raised. In terms of density, the Greater London Authority's (GLA) London Plan's drive was to optimise use of land in London generally to provide more houses, and these proposals were within density levels set for this type of location.
  - NHHT recognised the need for infrastructure facilities for existing and new residents and had not pushed forward with phase 4 as those were locations which could potentially accommodate additional facilities. Otherwise S106 agreements would provide contributions for facilities. South West Enfield Partnership (SWEP) had also been involved in these aspects. Site 11 proposals also included 230 sq.m. for a community use.
  - The GLA policies set a minimum amount of new parking at less than one space per unit at this type of location. Where possible NHHT had created additional spaces, and a car club was also proposed.
  - Studies of increase in traffic generated by these developments, by TfL, indicated in the morning peak for all three sites there would be an additional 24 cars. It was also worth noting that in the 2011 census 39% of households in the area around Sites 11 and 14 did not own a car. This was new build and new residents moving in would be aware of the restricted parking. People with cars would avoid these developments.
  - Through demolition rather than piecemeal development on Site 6 there would be much more cohesive development, with new family housing. Across the three sites, 72 three and four-bed properties were proposed, as against the existing 26 family units. There would also be a mixture of tenures including private sale and shared ownership. There was also a need for one and two-bed units as well as family properties.
2. Mr Ewout Vandeweghe, Stock Woolstencroft, as the architect provided more detail on the design and rationale, illustrated by slides:
- Proposals for Site 11 had been reviewed and were now for a six-storey development stepping down to two storey, and a mews development, and L-shaped building on the corner. Elevations and layouts were shown, including a shared surface around the mews.
  - Proposals for Site 14 had been revised substantially with a reduction by 20 units, and would provide a residentially friendly environment to the rear.
  - Proposals for Site 6 a and b had been scaled down and reduced in height, and would be predominantly two and four-storey.

## 4

### QUESTIONS BY PANEL MEMBERS

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

NOTED the following questions and observations from Members of the Panel.

1. Members asked about the following issues:
  - a. What would the child yield be from these development, and what proposals were there for additional school places for those children?
  - b. What was the size of the proposed community hall referred to, in comparison with other local halls?
  - c. In the London Plan, parking provision standards ranged from 1 to 2.5 spaces for three-bed homes: had the developer worked on lower or higher range figures?
  - d. Considering that in Outer London, people were likely to want cars, would the developers consider raising the parking provision to at least 1 space per unit?
  - e. How much total housing in volume would be for social housing?
  - f. What was meant by 'mews'?
  - g. Were there sewage or flooding problems in the area?
  
2. Responses were provided, including the following:
  - a. Officers did not have precise child yield figures available at the meeting, but the Council had clear policies in respect of calculating contributions for education under S106 agreements. A formula set out in the Local Plan was used to set the financial contribution which the Council put towards education in the borough. There was currently significant expansion of primary schools (including Garfield School) to meet existing and projected demand including for expected yield from these developments.
  - b. The applicants advised that the community hall in Site 11 would be equivalent to approximately 2/3 of the Trinity at Bowes hall being used for this meeting. There was potential in phase 4 to bring through such facilities which met people's needs. More information was requested on the size of the community hall in comparison to the size of the development itself – to be added to the minutes.

**ACTION: NHHT**

  - c. At the upper end of their range, the maximum parking provision defined by the GLA was 1 space per one and two-bed property, and 1.5 to 2 spaces for four-bed homes.
  - d. These developments were in an area which was highly accessible by public transport, with PTAL ratings of between 5 and 2. This was reflected in the parking ratios, which were higher for some of the sites than others. All properties three-bed and upwards were considered family units and each unit had a parking space. The lower parking provisions were for the smaller units. It was considered that first time buyers would be attracted to the one and two-bed units and many would not have cars. Discussions were also progressing on a car club, which would also discourage car ownership.
  - e. The proposals were for mixed tenure schemes, including for social rent, shared ownership, and private sale, with a minimum of 40% in line with the borough target being affordable. Within affordable housing it was envisaged 60% rental and 40% shared ownership.
  - f. A mews house was typically a small sized terrace, two or three storeys, with limited front garden, and accessed off a cobbled street. A

characteristic of traditional mews housing was a shared surface. It was also confirmed that the developments on Site 11 adjacent to the school would have no windows facing the school boundary.

g. It was advised that no damp areas or sewage problems had been identified. The sites were not in a flood risk area and the developers had not been asked to do a flood risk assessment.

## 5

### QUESTIONS BY WARD COUNCILLORS / MP

NOTED the following questions and observations from Ward Councillors and MP:

1. Councillor Alan Barker (Southgate Green Ward Councillor) asked about the heights of the buildings on both sides of the road and potential for the tall buildings to cause a wind tunnel effect and push vehicle exhaust emissions up to high levels. He suggested that a 3D model be provided to assist consideration at Planning Committee.

In response it was advised that the landscaping proposals would break the transition from vertical to horizontal surface, eg. the line of trees alongside Site 14. Also, buildings had been designed so that clean air would be drawn to the backs of homes, away from the road. He did not envisage the problem to which the councillor referred.

2. Councillor Alan Sitkin (Bowes Ward Councillor) made the following comments:
  - a. There had been concerns from the outset at the way the developments were being done on a piecemeal basis.
  - b. He would have liked to see an overall vision, and concrete plans in respect of social infrastructure, GP surgeries, etc.
  - c. An adaption to the schedule so phases 3 and 4 were not so far apart would be preferable and to confirm that the social infrastructure needed would be in place to mitigate the numbers of new residents.
3. Councillor Yasemin Brett (Bowes Ward Councillor) made the following comments:
  - a. She agreed with points made by Councillor Sitkin, particularly regarding the phasing.
  - b. There would be loss of jobs in shops and businesses in Ritz Parade, which was unfortunate in these economically difficult times.
  - c. She shared residents' frustrations at poor liaison and concerns about sewage infrastructure which was already inadequate and constant digging and works in the area. She urged consideration with TfL and Thames Water to minimise disruption to local people who have had to live with constant change in this area.
  - d. She appreciated that there was money allocated to be spent by 2014 and that they were lucky to get new housing as people needed it, and officers had worked to improve sustainability.
  - e. She re-iterated the request that a 3D model be provided.

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

In response it was confirmed that phase 4 would see additional facilities, and that the proposals tied in with the evolving AAP. Funding was controlled by the GLA and was part of the reason behind the phasing. The 55 units previously referred to involved money needed to be spent by March 2014. The affordable element involved money to be spent by March 2015, which meant construction should start on site at least by September this year. If phase 4 did not progress as envisaged, the Council would still gain S106 contributions.

A huge range of organisations and Council departments had to be consulted before and after a planning application was submitted. The applicant would have to resolve any issues raised or appropriate conditions would be added to any planning permission granted.

In respect of employment, it was advised the AAP brought out employment opportunities in the area. The SWEP had an Employment Sub Group. The developers also ran a construction employment initiative. It was also advised there was no employment on these sites, and these applications would not remove any employment land.

4. David Burrowes MP (Enfield Southgate Constituency) made the following comments:
  - a. He stated an interest as he was a governor of Broomfield School.
  - b. He supported improved development and regeneration, and the opportunity should be taken for people to work together to gain improved roads, housing and infrastructure so they could get back a community.
  - c. He questioned if the committee would be able to take full account of the AAP in determining the appropriateness and sustainability of the development.
  - d. It was estimated over 400 cars would seek to negotiate the access to Wilmer Way from Site 11 and he was concerned how danger would be mitigated.
  - e. The proposals were of an intense and overbearing nature.
  - f. Proposals for Site 14 perpetuated the isolated nature of the site and lack of easy access to leisure space.
  
5. Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration, highlighted the context and phasing of the proposals. The AAP could not be adopted until the overall Core Strategy had been approved. NHHT had to start the work on the properties in the meantime, and housing grants were a driver and a pressure. The draft AAP had now been approved for consultation and could be taken into account in the planning process.

## 6

### OPEN SESSION - QUESTIONS AND VIEWS FROM THE FLOOR

NOTED the following questions and observations from attendees:

**PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013**

1. A Ritz Parade business tenant advised they were not aware of any recent meetings with the businesses, but that NHHT had served them with a notice to leave, and jobs would be lost as a result. She also asked for more information about Site 11, particularly the pathway serving the mews houses, no rear windows in those houses backing onto Broomfield School, and confirmation that there would be two way passing traffic, as drawings appeared unrealistic. A personal application for planning permission for a secondary access here in 2010 had been refused on grounds that it would lead to potentially dangerous vehicle stopping and slowing, and she did not feel such permission should be given to the developers.

In response, the JMP traffic consultant advised that there was sufficient width for vehicles to pass each other and still sufficient width for pedestrians to move. People using this shared space would effectively act as a traffic calming measure. The idea of shared space was equal use by a mixture of traffic and pedestrians. A detailed transport assessment had been submitted to back up the application, and there had been discussions with TfL, GLA and the Council's Traffic and Transportation Team. Parking provision here was for 32 new parking spaces, so two vehicles meeting would occur once in a while, but movements would be mainly tidal. Access for refuse and emergency vehicles had been tested and verified.

It was also advised there was one small part of a business tenancy affected in Site 11, due to the impact on the yard area at the end of the proposed mews.

2. A representative of Broomfield Home-owners and Residents' Association advised that the association had circulated a sheet of nine questions for NHHT, and highlighted the following points:
  - a. Broomfield Road at the back of Site 6 would be directly impacted as it would be used for access and there would be a significant increase in traffic.
  - b. Broomfield Road was likely to experience overspill parking, and the proposals would take away around 50% of its existing on-street parking.
  - c. A lot of the trees which characterised the street would be lost, and the setting of the 150-year old cottages would be destroyed by a development of this scale and density. The blocks overlooking Broomfield Road would have a huge impact. 95 of the 125 new units would have a direct impact on their street of 25 units and would be quite overwhelming. It was recognised that the derelict sites needed to be developed, but this should be done without alienating the community.
  - d. Such proposals would not be considered acceptable in more affluent areas, and this scheme was out of character in this vicinity too.
  - e. Residents considered the designs ugly and not in context in the area.

Applicants advised that the street parking was recognised as a potential issue, but this was informal parking now available due to the current situation in Broomfield Road. Councillor Hurer suggested opening dialogue to discuss a compromise. It was confirmed that the applicants would be re-

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

submitting an amended application including reduction of the development and parking at a higher ratio, and the Council would be re-consulting on it.

3. The headteacher of Broomfield School raised the following concerns:
  - a. While recognising that redevelopment opportunities were positive, these proposals would damage the quality of the school environment in the view of the school's management and governors.
  - b. The resulting inevitable increase in the number of children in the area would mean it was more important that the school was enhanced.
  - c. Focusing on Site 11, at the moment there was a playground area to the side of the school building. It was a light, quiet area with trees where children often sat to have lunch. The proposed development came right up to the school perimeter, with one side of the three storey mews houses having a blank wall facing the school. School representatives had several meetings, but NHHT had failed to adequately address the concerns. The school had been offered additional planting, but this was unlikely to thrive in what would become a gloomy claustrophobic playground.
  - d. S106 contributions would go towards education generally in the borough and may not come to this school.
  - e. Plans showed a red line running inside the school perimeter, and it was unclear what this meant.
  - f. There were concerns about greater danger for pedestrians as the roadway was confirmed to take traffic both ways, but would not have a pavement?

The applicant confirmed meetings with the current and previous headteacher and there had been sunlight studies on the impact. The red line on the plans was technical and related to works to be done behind the mews houses. There were bits of land they would like to give to the school. At the moment there was a poor quality access road and a poor quality boundary to the school. There was a desire to reach something that would work for both parties. There were continuing discussions in relation to the shared surface: there would be no pavement but there may be distinction by colour. This had worked very successfully in other schemes elsewhere.

4. An attendee raised concerns in relation to Site 14 and that the proposal would introduce 62 flats in blocks up to six storeys in height in what had been a service road. This would be against the Core Strategy.
5. An attendee was concerned about taking of garden space from residents who were already NHHT residents and loss of trees to facilitate the development at Site 11. He also questioned the introduction of hundreds of homes at the busiest junction of the busiest road in London.
6. Questions were raised about the S106 contributions, and that money for education and health facilities could be made available before the start of phase 4: the Council was urged to take monies that were being offered as early as possible. The Planning Decisions Manager advised that S106 contributions were based on looking at all the sites together, and adequate infrastructure provision for all the developments. Trigger points were

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

incorporated at varying stages for the payments, and discussions were ongoing on the size of contributions.

7. Residents questioned the siting of 62 units at Site 14 in a land-locked area with the only access through a cul-de-sac. Not enough consideration had been given to the existing residents, especially those in Pevensy Avenue, and Bexhill and Hastings Roads who would be affected by increased traffic.
8. Attendees highlighted that population densities in Bowes Ward were already above the borough average, and these proposals would raise the population enormously, without the infrastructure to serve them. Density issues were highly relevant and should not be dismissed.
9. Attendees stated that a lot of people liked to live here due to the area's suburban character of mostly two storey homes. These developments would lead to loss of trees and green spaces, and demolition of Victorian villas which were not beyond repair. High rise blocks would change the nature of the area. The AAP also opposed back garden developments, but that is what the mews houses were.
10. Attendees requested more detail about the expected child yield from the developments, which would introduce many more children into the area, and how the demand for school places would be met.
11. A residents' association member queried the references to housing grants driving the timing, and felt that adequate time should be taken to get the development right, and it should not be accepted as imperative to begin construction by September. The developments would also be built before the AAP was ratified, and many new residents would be brought into the area where there would never be facilities to support them. These residents would also need cars as east-west travel was very difficult without a car. The level of concern was apparent in the numbers attending this meeting.
12. Attendees expressed dissatisfaction with images of the proposed developments produced by the applicant, particularly pictures showing mature trees in front of the buildings and it was questioned whether such aged trees would be planted. Residents would also like to see a scale model of all phases.
13. An attendee stated that Ritz Parade was a lovely historic parade and should be preserved. Residents feared it may be demolished, and that a slice of Broomfield School playing fields opposite may be lost.
14. An attendee asked how much S106 monies were expected, their timing, and assurance that all S106 contributions would be ringfenced and utilised for the benefit of the community affected.

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

The Planning Decisions Manager advised there was no final figure, but the contributions would be ringfenced to the AAP area, and focused to this area. There were S106 agreements linked to each of the applications. Contributions to education provision had already been secured from applications granted, and there were more significant elements to come.

15. A resident of Westminster Drive commented that their road had been identified as at high flood risk. It sat low down and in line with Site 6. The residents also felt they would be eclipsed by the development which would cut their light and privacy.
16. A resident of Seafield Road commented that this was also considered a high flood risk area, and surely nearby Site 11 would be too.
17. An attendee quoted paragraphs of the New Southgate masterplan guidance which should also be applied in this case and were inconsistent with these proposals. These developments would not improve the neighbourhood, or respect the context of the area, and the flats would lead to high population turnover. It was questioned why NHHT was acting like a private developer and seemed motivated by maximising the return on their investment above balancing what was good for the community, and why the Council was prepared to go along with that strategy.
18. In response to a resident's query it was confirmed that 40% of the development would be social housing. Details of the full mix of housing type were requested. **The Chairman asked that these details and other written answers be appended to the minutes and published on the Council's website.**

### FOR ACTION

19. At the close of the meeting, all attendees confirmed by show of hands that they were not in principle opposed to regeneration of the area, but no-one was supportive of the applications under consideration.

## 7

### CLOSE OF MEETING

#### NOTED

1. The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.
2. Notes taken at this meeting would be appended to the Planning Officers' reports to be considered by the Planning Committee when the applications were presented for decision at a future meeting.
3. A full report for each application would be prepared by Planning Officers for Planning Committee. This would form part of the agenda for the

## PLANNING PANEL - 28.2.2013

meeting and would be published on the Council's website at least a week before the meeting.

4. There was a deputation procedure whereby involved parties could request to address the Planning Committee meeting: details on the Council website [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk) or via the Planning Committee Secretary 020 8379 4093 / 4091 [jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk) or [metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk) and residents could also ask ward councillors to speak on their behalf.