

# Public Document Pack



## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 5th September, 2023 at 7.00 pm  
Conference Room, Civic Centre, Silver  
Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA

Contact: Harry Blake-Herbert  
Governance Officer  
Direct: 020-8132-0807  
Tel: 020-8379-1000  
Ext: 0807

E-mail: [Democracy@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Democracy@enfield.gov.uk)

Council website: [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk)

## MEMBERS

Councillors: Sinan Boztas (Chair), Mahym Bedekova (Vice-Chair), Josh Abey, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Peter Fallart, Thomas Fawns, Ahmet Hasan, Bektas Ozer, Michael Rye OBE, Jim Steven, and Eylem Yuruk.

**N.B. Involved parties may request to make a deputation to the Committee by contacting [Democracy@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Democracy@enfield.gov.uk) before 10am on the meeting date latest**

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA – UPDATE TO MEMBERS

### 4. REPORT OF THE HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (Pages 1 - 4)

To receive and note the covering report of the Head of Development Management.

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**5<sup>h</sup> September 2023**REPORT OF:**Director of Planning & Growth  
Brett Leahy**Subject:****Planning Committee – 5<sup>th</sup> September 2023****Update for Members**

Contact officer:

Andy Higham – Head of Development Management  
Email: andy.higham@enfield .gov.uk  
Tel: 020 8132 0711**Update to Planning Committee**

Ahead of Tuesday's Planning Committee meeting, please note the following updates to the Committee report will be of assistance to Members in your assessment of the proposals.

**Agenda Item: 6****22/01542/OUT - Anglo Aquarium Plant, 30 and 32 Strayfield Road, Enfield, EN2 9JE**

1. For the avoidance of doubt, this addendum is to correct the typos of the committee report identified since the publication of the report, which do not change the assessment of the main report.

<b>Relevant paragraph of the main report</b>	<b>Updates</b>
2.3 and 11.3	<p>Paragraphs. 2.3 and 11.3 of the main report describe the affordable housing as “<i>including 50% social rented homes and <u>50% family homes</u></i>”.</p> <p>The correct proportion of family homes (i.e. 3 bed units) is <u>69%</u> of the proposed dwellinghouses as stated in the rest of the main report.</p>
9.102	<p>Paragraph 9.102 of the main report states “<i>Given <u>the proposed maximum eaves height (5.3m) and ridge height (8.2m)</u>...</i>”.</p> <p>The correct maximum ridge height of the proposed development is <u>8.5m</u> as stated in the rest of the main report. Condition 5 would restrict the proposed development to a maximum height to two storeys and a maximum ridge height to 8.5m.</p>
9.188	<p>Paragraph 9.188 in relation to Community Infrastructure Levy states “<i>the proposed development involves <u>100% London Affordable Rent</u>. It would be eligible for Mandatory Social Housing CIL relief</i>”</p> <p>The correct sentence is “<i>the proposed development involves <u>100% affordable homes</u></i>”. The proposed affordable homes comprise 50%</p>

	Social Rent, 40% London Shared Ownership and 10% London Living Rent as stated in the rest of the main report.
Table 5	Table 5 shows the London Living Rent homes constitute <u>19%</u> of the proposed dwellinghouses.  The correct figure is <u>10%</u> as stated in the rest of the main report.

2. Since the publication of the Committee report, comments have been received from 1 Rosendale Close on 30 August 2023, who also submitted comments during public consultation. As requested by the objector, the full comments received on 30 August 2023 are appended to this addendum. The comments have been summarised in paragraph 6.46 of the main report and been fully addressed in the main report.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 August 2023 14:42  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Strayfield Road Planning application

Dear [REDACTED]

Please could you represent the collective views of the residents of Rossendale Close at the Planning Committee meeting on 5th September. We directly neighbour the Anglo Aquarium Plant on Strayfield Road and we are unanimously opposed to the proposed development of this site.

We would like raise serious concerns about the plan for 58 homes and additional office/retail space. This could potentially equate to 300 more people in the area and up to 150 vehicles. This would be completely inappropriate for this quiet and peaceful region which is predominantly greenbelt for the following reasons:

1. Strayfield Road is an unadopted bridleway which is already under strain as we have a school, church, cricket club, commercial businesses and residential properties which all currently use the road for access preventing the primary use of the bridleway which is equestrian access. The sheer volume of traffic in the morning and afternoon because of the school, creates a bottleneck at the lower end of the road and prevents access to the residents and during the weekend the church and cricket ground traffic is overwhelming. The road receives no council maintenance and is covered with a patchwork of tarmac, strewn with potholes.

There is no pavement and the proposal of a give way access for vehicles will be total chaos during peak times during the week and all day during the weekends.

The planned proposal has a density of properties which is inappropriate for the size of the plot with ONE access point being Strayfield Road only. This is a huge health and safety concern as if there was an emergency, emergency vehicles would not be able to access the site because of the existing traffic along the road and the single lane bottleneck at the lower end of Strayfield Road. The only other access to the site is via The Ridgeway past Rectory Farm but these roads are narrow and inaccessible for everyday use.

2. Strayfield Road has no lighting and therefore would be dangerous during the evenings and most of the winter as an increased number of pedestrians and cars driving up and down the road would no doubt cause collisions and accidents. The lack of lighting is also likely to be a hotspot for criminal activity with so many new residents migrating into the area.

3. There is not enough provision in the area for transport links. There is a single 456 bus route and this bus is already troublesome coming up and down Clay Hill which is far too narrow a road for large vehicles passing each other. I have witnessed many collisions on this road over the years. Putting homes on Strayfield Road will only increase the traffic flow, further risking accidents and lives.

4. There are no amenities in walking distance from the area such as shops, doctor's surgeries, secondary schools, libraries etc, therefore car usage will inevitably be greater. This will directly increase air pollution in the area and surrounding habitats. Even if residents wanted to walk further afield to amenities in adjoining areas there is totally inadequate pavement on Clay Hill to do so. The fast flowing traffic along Clay Hill is nothing more than completely dangerous for walkers.

5. There would be years of construction traffic in the region which would be a total nuisance to the current residents and their quality of life not to mention the lack of privacy during the construction and forever more afterwards.

6. To describe the plan as the construction of 'affordable dwellings' is totally preposterous. Single bedroom flats command a rent of £1350 in the region and the cost of homes can be anything between £750000 to £2000000. This

development will be nothing more but an opportunity for wealthy property investors to buy and rent out for financial gain and not truly benefit local community. Rental markets also attract a transient base of residents which bring their own set of issues and problems into an otherwise peace locality.

7. A new use for the brownfield site would be destructive of current flora and fauna in the region together with existing wildlife.

From a personal prospective, we have been living at our property which is situated right next to the proposed development for the past 17 years. The new residential site would personally impact our lives and property massively due to its extremely close approximation. It would cause us noise pollution due to the gardens directly backing onto the road adjacent to our property and the increased volume of traffic that will be passing by us on a daily basis. We would also be impacted by visual pollution and loss of privacy as our bedroom's Juliet balcony doors and another bedroom's windows open directly to overlook the whole site.

This proposal of urban sprawl would be disastrous for the status quo in the region. Crews Hill is one of the last regions of Greenbelt and natural beauty in North London, please don't be a part of its destruction and demise. We need to protect our area for generations to come.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]