N.B. Any member of the public interested in attending the meeting should ensure that they arrive promptly at 7:15pm. Please note that if the capacity of the room is reached, entry may not be permitted. Public seating will be available on a first come first served basis.

Involved parties may request to make a deputation to the Committee by contacting the committee administrator before 12:00 noon on 17/07/17.

AGENDA – PART 1

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members of the Planning Committee are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary, other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to items on the agenda.

3. REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, REGENERATION AND PLANNING (REPORT NO. 39) (Pages 1 - 2)

To receive the covering report of the Assistant Director, Regeneration and Planning.

3.1 Applications dealt with under delegated powers. (A copy is available in the Members’ Library).
4. **16/04324/FUL - FORMER TREN T PARK CAMPUS, TREN T PARK, ENFIELD** (Pages 3 - 92)

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to securing an appropriate Legal Agreement, the Head of Development Control be authorised to Grant planning permission subject to conditions.
WARD: Cockfosters

5. **16/04375/LBC - FORMER MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY TREN T PARK, BRAML EY ROAD, N14 4YZ** (Pages 93 - 150)

RECOMMENDATION: Approval subject to conditions.
WARD: Cockfosters

6. **16/00272/RE4 - TUR IN ROAD PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, TUR IN ROAD, LONDON N9 8BT** (Pages 151 - 162)

RECOMMENDATION: Approval subject to conditions
WARD: Jubilee

7. **17/02280/RE4 - 201 HERTFORD ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 5JH** (Pages 163 - 180)

RECOMMENDATION: Approval subject to conditions
WARD: Enfield Highway

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

If necessary, to consider passing a resolution under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 excluding the press and public from the meeting for any items of business moved to part 2 of the agenda on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in those paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).
(There is no part 2 agenda)
3.1 APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

3.1.1 In accordance with delegated powers, 655 applications were determined between 16/06/2017 and 06/07/2017, of which 428 were granted and 227 refused.

3.1.2 A Schedule of Decisions is available in the Members’ Library.

Background Papers

To be found on files indicated in Schedule.

3.2 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS TO DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS

On the Schedules attached to this report I set out my recommendations in respect of planning applications and applications to display advertisements. I also set out in respect of each application a summary of any representations received and any later observations will be reported verbally at your meeting.

Background Papers

(1) Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states that the Local Planning Authority shall have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations. Section 54A of that Act, as inserted by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, states that where in making any determination under the Planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless the material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the London Borough of Enfield is the London Plan (March 2015), the Core Strategy (2010) and the Development Management Document (2014) together with other supplementary documents identified in the individual reports.

(2) Other background papers are those contained within the file, the reference number of which is given in the heading to each application.
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**REPORT**

**Location:** Former Trent Park Campus, Trent Park, Enfield

**Proposal:** Phased redevelopment of site to provide a total of 262 residential units (134 apartments, 128 houses, including 18 affordable units) with museum, cafe and leisure uses, ancillary parking, vehicle and pedestrian access routes and cycle ways, involving the demolition of Bevan Hall, Lakeview, Wisteria Building, Jebb Building, the Student Union, Gubbay Hall, the Sports Hall, Sassoon Hall, the Bothy, South Lodge, Music Block and ancillary structures, restoration and change of use of The Mansion House to museum/event space with ancillary cafe (980 sq.m Class D1) at ground floor (in part) and basement levels with 15 residential units above; restoration of the Orangery and swimming pool involving single storey extension to provide gym/fitness facility (344 sq.m, Class D2); conversion of the Dower House into 2 houses involving partial demolition, extension and internal/external alterations; refurbishment of Gardeners Cottage involving alterations to fenestration; works to Rookery Lodge involving demolition of lean to and erection of part single, part 2-storey rear extension; conversion of The Stable Block to 15 residential units; erection of 232 new dwellings in a mix of one to four storey buildings with garages and vehicle parking at surface and undercroft/basement levels, together with restoration of landscaped public amenity areas, including statues, urns and gates, and outdoor tennis courts, provision of on-site childrens play space and sustainable drainage systems; surfacing and laying out of existing hockey club car park, highway alterations to the junction of Snakes Lane with Bramley Road and pedestrian crossing, including erection of shuttle bus garage and driver facilities, bus shelter, single family dwelling house and provision of cycle parking. (An Environmental Statement, including a non-technical summary, also accompanies the planning application in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, as amended 2015.

**Applicant Name & Address:** Berkeley Homes North East London LTD

**Agent Name & Address:**

Mr Iain Rhind
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Nathaniel Lichfield And Partners
14 Regents Whalf
All Saints Street
N1 9RL

**Recommendation:** Subject to the securing an appropriate Legal Agreement, the Head of Development Management be authorised to **Grant** planning permission subject to conditions.
1. Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application site has an area of 22.7 hectares and sits within the wider Trent Country Park (approximately 170 hectares). The history of the site, which goes back to the 12th Century, includes work undertaken by Sir William Chambers, Francis Bevan and Sir Philip Sassoon during their ownerships of the estate as well as the site’s requisition by the War Office during World War II when it was used as a highly specialised prisoner of war camp, run by a Secret Service unit known as MI19.

1.2 The site is located to the north of Oakwood and the east of Cockfosters and sits within London’s Metropolitan Green Belt. It is designated as a Major Developed Site (MDS) in the Green Belt by the adopted Local Plan.

1.3 The main vehicular access to the site is via Snakes Lane, a private road within the applicant’s ownership, which runs from the site to Bramley Road (A110). There is a private route through Trent Country Park to the west (Lime Avenue) which is only accessible by foot and cycle but provides emergency vehicle access. The site has a PTAL rating of 0 (zero). However, Oakwood and Cockfosters Underground stations are slightly over 1km from the site and there are bus services at both Cockfosters Road and Bramley Road.

1.4 The site contains a number of historic buildings, statues and sculptures, which sit alongside large post-war buildings. The Mansion House is listed Grade II, the surrounding parkland is Grade II registered and the site falls within a designated Conservation Area. Trent Park and the Mansion Terrace are currently identified on Historic England’s Register of Heritage at Risk. A number of statues and sculptures within the parkland are of historic value and are also Grade II listed. In total, there are approximately 25 buildings and historic statues on the site, including some buildings which are identified as positive contributors to the Trent Park Conservation Area i.e. non-designated heritage assets (including the Stables, Garden Cottage, the Walled Garden, the Bothy, Rookery Lodge, and the Dower House).

1.5 Alongside the Mansion House and other more historic buildings, the Campus includes post-war higher educational buildings, mostly dating from the 1960s and 1970s, after the site became a teacher training school following its acquisition by the Council after the Second World War. There are a number of unused tennis courts at the western end of the site in a poor state of repair.

1.6 Beyond the application site, but still within the applicant’s ownership, is the Southgate Hockey Club (subject to a long lease agreement). The Hockey Club’s informal car parking area, adjacent to Snakes Lane, is included within the application site and works are proposed to formalise the parking arrangements. The applicant submitted a separate planning application (LPA ref. 16/05472/FUL) to deliver an overspill car park for the Hockey Club to the west of the existing car park and its all-weather pitches i.e. beyond the red line application boundary subject to the main planning application. This application was granted planning permission on 19 April 2017.

1.7 Immediately adjoining the site’s western boundary is the Wildlife Rescue Centre. There are private dwellings to the south-west (Rookery Cottages and Dairy House), south (South View and North View) and south-east (on Southern Lane). The Trent Park Golf Club lies to the south, farmland/woodland to the east, a lake and parkland to the north and further woodland/parkland to the west.

1.8 For the information of Members, the site was vacated by Middlesex University in 2012 and purchased by the Allianze University College of Medical Sciences (AUCMS) in 2013. AUCMS went into liquidation in November 2014. The former university campus, campus was put up for sale again in 2015 by which point it had been vacant for three years. The site was acquired by the applicant in September 2015. The site has not yet been brought back into use and has therefore now been vacant for five years.
2. Proposal

2.1 Full planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the site as follows:

a) The demolition of various existing buildings on site comprising Bevan Hall, Lakeview, Wisteria Building, Jebb Building, the Student Union, Gubbay Hall, the Sports Hall, Sassoon Hall, the Bothy, South Lodge and ancillary structures (a total of 24,125sqm of floorspace);

b) The restoration of the site’s listed heritage assets and their change of use as follows:
   i) The Mansion House to a mix of 980sqm of D1 use (museum/event space/ancillary café) in part of the ground floor and basement and residential C3 use in the remainder (15 dwellings);
   ii) The Orangery (plus a new extension) to 344sqm of D2 leisure use (gym), with full restoration of the swimming pool;
   iii) The restoration of The Stable Block, the Dower House, the Gardener’s Cottage and Rookery Lodge and conversion to C3 residential use (15 dwellings)

c) Construction of 232 new dwellings (C3 residential use) in the form of houses and apartments, ranging from 1 to 4 storeys in height;

d) A total of 262 residential units (35,663sqm GIA), including 58 affordable units, comprising 128 houses and 134 apartments with the following mix: 1 bedroom: 32 units (12%)
   2 bedroom: 76 units (29%)
   3 bedroom: 72 units (28%)
   4 bedroom: 72 units (28%)
   5 bedroom: 19 units (7%)

e) A landscape restoration scheme across the whole site including:
   i) Lakes and Cascade: clearance around the lake to enhance views from the Mansion North Lawn, American Garden and Arboretum; retention of specimen trees and reincorporation of others into pleasure grounds;
   ii) Reinstatement of late 19th Century grass terrace, Ice House Wood and the Water Garden;
   iii) reinstatement of pleached lime avenue, Wisteria Walk and the Long Garden;
   iv) reinstatement of lily ponds and the surrounding hedges;
   v) The Orangery and the Pool Garden: removal of shrubs and reduction of overgrown hedges to recreate historic proportions;
   vi) Daffodil Lawn: reinstatement of historic horticulture;
   vii) Walled Garden: repair of the walls, refurbishment of the central pool and axial paths;
   viii) Statues, urns and gates: revealing, cleaning and repair (as necessary) of currently boxed-in statutes, urns and gates.

f) Implementation and management: Adoption of a landscape management strategy for the long-term upkeep of the Registered landscape;

g) Site-wide sustainable drainage system (SUD’s) incorporated into the historic landscape;

h) Provision of 12.24ha of publicly accessible amenity space with various new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian routes (including the potential for a new bridge link to the north into Trent Country Park);

i) 0.74ha of landscaped communal amenity space for residents of the apartment blocks;

j) 1,490sqm of on-site children’s play space;

k) Restoration of the site’s outdoor tennis courts;

l) Car parking associated with the development (on curtilage, surface level and undercroft/basement for the dwellings, along with disabled parking, Car Club spaces, visitor parking, coach parking and courtesy minibus parking);

m) A courtesy shuttle bus running along Snakes Lane with associated alterations to Snakes Lane at the junction with Bramley Road to include a turning circle with bus shelter, garage with driver facilities and cycle parking, along with new pedestrian crossings;

n) Works to formalise Southgate Hockey Club’s informal parking area within the Application Site to provide 103 formal car parking spaces;

o) 487 cycle parking spaces for residents and 38 visitor spaces.
2.2 There is also an application for Listed Building Consent that appears elsewhere on the Agenda seeking the demolition of extensions to the Mansion House and its restoration, conversion and extension (to include its terrace and forecourt); the demolition of the extension to the Orangery and its restoration, conversion and extension to include the swimming pool and the restoration of Wisteria Walk and the registered park in association with phased redevelopment of the site.

2.3 **Submitted Application Documents**

The following documents were submitted to accompany the planning and listed building consent applications:

i) LPA Application Form;
ii) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Additional Information Form;
iii) Comprehensive set of planning and listed building consent drawings (to be listed in full on the decision notice);
iv) Design and Access Statement;
v) Landscape Design Statement;
vi) Planning Statement with appended Alternative Uses Report
vii) Sustainability Statement;
viii) Energy Statement;
ix) Utilities Strategy;
x) Statement of Community Involvement;
xii) Transport Assessment;
xiii) Delivery and Servicing Plan;
xiv) Construction Logistics Plan;

2.4 An Environmental Statement (ES) has also been prepared to accompany the planning application in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (EIA) (England) regulations 2011 and the Town and Country (EIA) (Amendment) Regulations 2015. The Environmental Statement comprises:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 02: EIA Methodology</td>
<td>Part 2: Heritage Assessment (with Historic Landscape Assessment and Built Heritage Assessment included as built-in appendices)</td>
<td>Appendix B: Operational Waste and Recycling Management Strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 03: Alternatives and Design Evolution</td>
<td>Part 3: Verified Views (Existing and Proposed)</td>
<td>Appendix C: Health Impact Assessment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 04: The Proposed Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix D: Transport (including traffic data and any consultation responses);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 05: Demolition, Construction and Refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix E: Noise and Vibration (including any data, model outputs or N&amp;V specific glossary of terms);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 06: Socio-Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix F: Air Quality (including any data, model outputs, AQ neutral assessment etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 07: Transportation and Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix G: Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 08: Noise and Vibration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 09: Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10: Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Post-submission, the following plans / documents were also submitted:

i) Amended Planning and listed building consent drawings (including SUDs details);
ii) Addendum to the Design and Access Statement;
iii) Addendum to the Landscape Design Statement;
iv) Statement of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Conformity;
v) Addendum to the Transport Assessment;
vii) Updated CIL Additional Information Form
vii) Further Information and Clarification to Support the Ecological Impact Assessment
viii) Revisions to housing mix / affordable housing numbers in light of negotiations regarding development viability and its ability to support greater affordable housing.

3. Relevant Planning Decisions

3.1 The site has been the subject of various small scale applications for planning permission and listed building consent over the years which are relatively minor in nature. There have, however, been some major applications the most relevant of which are the two submitted in 2005 by Middlesex University:

i) TP/05/1058 - Detailed application (First Phase) for a new Learning Resource Centre with academic accommodation including a 200 seat lecture theatre and associated facilities, new 3-storey student residential building for 100 students with ancillary space, cycle and disabled facilities and associated plant and servicing, including new substation / chillers and refuse compound area, as well as new landscaping and surfacing works around both buildings.

ii) TP/05/1168 - Outline Planning Application (siting and means of access) for the development of the existing University Campus at Trent Park involving the construction of up to 24,700 sq. m. of non-residential institution floor space (Use Class D1), up to 10,000 sq. m. of student residential accommodation (providing accommodation for up to 382 students), 250 car parking spaces, improved access and bus turn around facilities at the southern end of Snakes Lane involving the removal of the Lodge building, pedestrian crossing facility (Bramley Road), ancillary services, facilities, associated roads, paths and other infrastructure, together with associated landscape improvements.

3.2 These applications were considered by the Council’s Planning Committee in January 2006 with an officer recommendation to approve. After consideration at the meeting, the recommendation was not accepted and both were refused planning permission for the following reason:

“The proposed development by virtue of its size, siting and scale would have inappropriate regard to the character and surroundings of Trent Park resulting in a form of development that would be inappropriately located in the Green Belt detrimental to its character and appearance contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 and (I) G1, (II) G1, (II) G11 as well as Policies (I) GD1 and (II) GD1 of the Unitary Development Plan”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Contamination;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11: Water Resources, Drainage and Flood Risk</td>
<td>Appendix H: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 12: Archaeology (Buried Heritage)</td>
<td>Appendix I: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 13: Ecology</td>
<td>Appendix J: Ecology (including all ecology reports);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 14: Effect Interactions</td>
<td>Appendix K: Arboriculture (including Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Pre-application Consultation**

London Borough of Enfield

4.1 A number (over 20) of pre-application meetings were held between the applicant's consultant team and Officers between September 2015 and submission of the application in September 2016. These meetings have continued post-submission including design workshops and meetings with the Council’s other officers regarding heritage, SuDS, ecology and transport. The scheme has also been presented to the Council’s Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) on four occasions, the Enfield Planning Panel and to a Design Review Panel (via Urban Design London).

4.2 A Working Group (The Trent Park Working Group) was established at the request of Full Council in response to the imminent sale of the site, made up of cross party local Councillors including the Ward Councillors. The applicant met with the Working Group on six occasions between October 2015 and August 2016 (prior to formal submission).

**Statutory Consultees**

4.3 Two pre-application meetings were held with the GLA (in April 2016 (including Transport for London) and July 2016) and various meetings were held with Historic England throughout 2016. Both consultees have been consulted and post-submission meetings have taken place in late 2016 and in 2017.

**Non-Statutory Consultees**

4.4 The Trent Park Community Council was set up by the applicant to include representatives of 18 key local interest groups and stakeholders with a specific interest in the progress of the proposed development at the site. There were six meetings between November 2015 and August 2016.

4.5 In addition to the Community Council meetings the applicant has advised that they have attended meetings with groups such as Friends of Trent Park and the Save Trent Park Campaign. They have also met Enfield Wildlife Rescue and Ambulance Service and the Southgate Hockey Club to try to ensure their operational requirements are fully considered.

**Community Engagement**

4.6 Members may be aware that the applicant organised a total of four public consultation events prior to submission of the application. Each event ran over three days (Friday to Sunday):

- 4th - 6th December 2015
- 26th - 28th February 2016
- 13th - 15th May 2016
- 8th - 10th July 2016.

4.7 A further post submission exhibition was held over two days on 4-5 November 2016. These public exhibitions were advertised in local newspapers and the applicant also prepared newsletters which were delivered to 8,000-10,000 local residents, with 500 to key local stakeholders. The applicant has confirmed that over 2000 people attended across the five exhibition dates. A dedicated website was also set up by the applicant to provide details of the application, consultation materials and a method for stakeholders to submit feedback and any questions. This website continues to be available. Monthly newsletters have also been issued on nine occasions by the applicant to 10,000 properties in the surrounding area.

4.8 In addition to this, to keep users of the wider Trent Country Park up to date on the proposals, the applicant erected two noticeboards on the site (following the granting of separate planning...
permissions from the Council), one at the eastern end of Lime Avenue and the other at the eastern end of Southern Lane. These boards provide opportunities to display updates on the scheme as well as information on upcoming events.

5. Consultation

5.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees

Urban Design

5.2 Overall, the Council’s Urban Design team are of the opinion the scheme has merit and will be a successful scheme. The Urban design team has worked closely with the applicant during the master plan process and on the detailed design of buildings including external appearance of and position of houses and apartment buildings. Conditions are imposed to ensure the delivery of a high quality exemplar development.

5.3 With regard to particular aspects of the development, the comments are as follows:

House Types (Adam Architecture)

5.4 Throughout the pre-application and application stages, we have spent a considerable amount of time to address a number of design matters within the house types submitted. The design development undertaken to address these has been welcome and the design of each house type has developed positively as a result. A greater emphasis and connection to the contextual review of style and period has also been welcome and is useful in justifying the overall approach. There remain some house types where the design requires further detailed refinement. These are set out below:

- T4 (proportion of g/f window openings)
- T7A (removal of contrast brick banding in favour of brick string course above g/f lintels)
- T4&T7C (proportion of g/f window opening to T4)
- T7&T8 (proportion of g/f window opening to T8)
- T8 (proportion of g/f window opening)
- T9 (proportion of f/f window opening above door)
- T9W (side elevation drawings missing)
- T10 (larger window openings on the side elevation where this fronts a street)
- T11D (front and rear elevation drawings missing)
- T9 Gubbay Park (proportion of f/f window opening above door)

5.5 These are relatively minor details in terms of the overall context of the scheme and it is considered that by addressing these points, the overall built form will be further enhanced relative to the heritage setting for the development. It is therefore recommended that a condition is imposed to secure the above amendments.

5.6 All house types should incorporate high quality detailing and deep reveal depths to window openings, although these detailed elements can be covered by suitable conditions.

The Glade

5.7 The overall architectural approach to this area of the site is welcomed. Again, there remain some elements that would benefit from some detailed design development. This will be secured by condition.

i) Layout

5.8 There would be benefit in undertaking further detailed review of the layout of this area to generate more direct relationships between the housing and public space surrounding the plots, particularly to the east-west pedestrian route either side of plots 129-121. For instance, the
relative position of the housing could assist the creation of more direct overlooking of this route from frontages. Although it is recognised there are constraints because of the topography of the site in this location, the imposition of a condition will enable the opportunity for any improvement to be addressed.

5.9 The boundary treatment and landscape master plan indicate the nature of the proposed boundary treatments but further detail is required to ensure there is adequate passive surveillance of routes with overlooking from surrounding properties to ensure the routes feel safe and welcoming. The detail of these boundary treatments can be suitably covered by condition for subsequent consideration.

5.10 Further detail is also required regarding the proposed layout in terms of bin stores/servicing etc. A condition to this effect requiring these details to be agreed however would be sufficient

ii) Building Design

5.11 As stated above, the overall architectural approach is supported. Further detail is required on the split of materials across the elevations. The contemporary approach is generating simple, elegant forms and the presence of differing materials in different proportions across the elevations may unintentionally compete with this, particularly as materials weather over time. To counter this, the primary cladding material could be extended further towards the ground, giving a uniform treatment across elevations while leaving a couple of courses of the lower material to provide a robust base at ground level.

5.12 Securing the necessary high quality materials and detailing throughout, although these elements can be covered through suitable condition.

Apartment Blocks

5.13 Revision of the architectural approach and treatment of elevations to the apartment blocks have addressed previous concerns over their appearance competing with the Mansion House across Daffodil Lawn. The submitted drawings are now acceptable in design terms. This is subject to caveats relating to materials and detailing to be covered through suitable conditions.

Walled Garden

5.14 The contemporary approach to the walled garden portion of the scheme is supported. The design has carefully taken cues from the historic context of the walled garden itself, with the composition of elevations well considered and balanced. Again, the final design will need to be supported through high quality materials and detailing through suitable conditions.

Orangery Extension

5.15 Further revisions to the orangery extension were submitted in April, addressing previous concerns over the plan form of the extension in relation to the Orangery building. The revised approach creates a symmetrical built footprint and elevation treatment that sits more comfortably against the symmetrical plan of the Orangery and its alignment with the swimming pool to the west.

5.16 A suitable response to the historic landscape has been achieved through the inclusion of hedging to reflect the offset geometry of the historic landscape when compared against the Orangery.

5.17 The revised drawings as submitted do not include the detail of the junction between the Orangery and extension. We have previously recommended that this junction should incorporate a glazed section using structural glazing, to ensure there is a clear visual break between the external wall of the Orangery and new extension. We had provided some examples as to how this could be achieved. This element should be covered by suitable condition to ensure that this detail can be successfully realised.
Landscape and Boundary Treatments

5.18 Supportive of the overall approach, although the detail of boundary treatments throughout the scheme should be covered by suitable condition.

Conservation Officer

5.19 The Conservation Officer raises no objection in principle and recognises the major beneficial effects of the development to the restoration of the grade II listed mansion, the surrounding landscape and Conservation Area. There is support for the comments and conclusions of the Urban Design Officer. Separate comments on the listed building are contained in the report on the application for listed building consent.

Sustainable Urban Drainage

5.20 No objection to the SUDs strategy subject to conditions requiring further details and a verification report following implementation (as set out in the Remarks Section of this report below).

Traffic and Transportation

5.21 Following the submission of various clarifications/details, no objection subject to conditions. (This is expanded upon in some detail in the Analysis Section of this report below).

Tree Officer

5.22 No arboricultural objection. Trees to be removed are either of limited heritage or amenity value and the extensive proposed mitigating landscape and tree planting will in the long-term bring significant benefits to the locality and outweigh the removal of the trees proposed. Some elements of tree removal are to re-instate elements of historical landscaping.

5.23 The proposed landscaping, tree planting and commitment from the developer to manage the site with arboricultural issues a key component of the development is very encouraging and the extensive pre-consultation has been very beneficial for the development in terms of the arboricultural considerations.

5.24 Conditions will be required regarding detailed tree protection, heritage tree and woodland management and landscape tree planting. The proposed SUDS swales and ponds will need to be located so as not to harm the roots of retained trees. Routing of services and utilities will need to be carefully considered so as not to detrimentally harm trees and conform to any submitted Tree Protection Plan.

Greater London Authority (GLA)

5.25 Consultation with the Mayor’s Office is a two-stage process and any resolution that the Planning Committee make on the proposal will need to be referred back to the Mayor for his consideration. The following comments were received in response to the Stage One consultation (31st October 2016). In summary, the proposed scheme is strongly supported in strategic planning terms, although the affordable housing offer at the time was unacceptable, and the application did not fully comply with the London Plan.

5.26 The points raised by the GLA were:

i) Principle of Development - the proposed residential-led redevelopment of this site is strongly supported;

ii) Green Belt - the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of Green Belt overall and would significantly enhance openness in key areas of the site, particularly in the setting of the Grade II Listed Mansion House;

iii) Education - the Council should confirm that this site is surplus to land requirements for meeting local educational and other social infrastructure need;

iv) Regeneration - the proposed development would deliver significant regenerative benefits associated with; new homes; historic building refurbishments; a public museum;
restoration of historic landscape features; and improved connections with the wider Trent Country Park;

v) Housing - the proposed delivery of high quality housing at this site is strongly supported. However, the applicant is required to commit to the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in line with the London Plan. Application of Vacant Building Credit (VBC) was not accepted and nor was 5% provision of affordable housing;

vi) Urban Design - the proposed scheme responds well to the opportunities and constraints of this site and setting, and represents a carefully considered Green Belt and heritage-led Masterplan that would sensitively optimise development potential;

vii) Historic Environment - the proposal would significantly enhance the setting of the Listed and Locally Listed Buildings at the site and significantly enhance the character of the Trent Park Conservation Area;

viii) Inclusive Access - the proposed approach to access and inclusion accords with the London Plan;

ix) Sustainable Development - following clarifications on the energy strategy, the Council will secure the associated energy and climate change adaptation measures by way of condition

ox) Transport - whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic transport terms, the applicants needs to address the issues raised with respect to: walking and cycling; parking; travel; delivery and construction logistics planning; and courtesy shuttle bus.

5.27 Discussions with the GLA have been on-going since October 2016 specifically in relation to viability/affordable housing. Following extensive discussion and a second viability review, the amount of affordable housing by unit was raised by Berkeley Homes to 22% (20% by habitable rooms). This offer is currently proposed in the form of 58 x 1 & 2 bed intermediate shared ownership units on site.

Thames Water

5.28 No objection subject to the inclusion of informatives.

Environment Agency

5.29 No objection subject to conditions.

Historic England

5.30 Historic England (HE) supports the principle of the redevelopment of the site and have indicated they are comfortable with this being determined by the Council as local planning authority. However, they have continued to provide support and guidance and concerns have been raised in relation to the location of the SUDs ponds in the landscape (subsequently amended within the 20 January 2017 submission, the need to justify the demolition of the Bothy also needed to be justified, the proposed SUDs water channel across the Daffodil Lawn (this was worked up in further detail with Historic England and formed part of the submitted documentation) and in relation to the terrace on the North Lawn were also clarified by the applicant. Suggest conditions in relation to details of public access to the site and a landscape maintenance plan, and that permitted development rights are removed for the new houses (included under the draft conditions/S106 heads of terms). Queried the design approach to The Glade area, which was subsequently amended in the 20 January 2017 submission.

5.32 Historic England responded to the consultation on the revisions in March 2017 2017 and they welcome the regeneration of the site and the works that will ensure that the Heritage At Risk Status of the Mansion Terrace and the Registered Landscape are addressed. They suggest a number of conditions in the event that any consent is granted, but they also indicate that there are some remaining matters which they are keen to be clarified via condition prior to any development commencing:

- Impact of the proposals on the landscaping in relation to the north lawn.
- Shared Surface through the western part of the Daffodil Lawn.
- Public access to the open landscaped areas and links through to the public park.
- The Glade Development.

5.33 The applicant responded to the above points on 4 April 2017 and HE has raised no further concern. In any case, while it is considered that the points raised are important, there remains sufficient control, principally through the suggested draft conditions, in order to ensure that the development is acceptable and does not have a detrimental impact on Trent Park.

5.34 Details of the hard and soft landscaping scheme throughout the site, including the North Lawn and the lower Mansion terrace, will need to be agreed before any landscaping works commence on site and Conditions 7 (Tree Protection), 10 (North Lake Buffer Zone Details) and 18 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) will allow the impact on the sensitive Registered Landscape to be carefully considered in consultation with HE. Similarly, the detail of the proposed SuDS system will be considered through Condition 12 (Sustainable Drainage Strategy) covering amongst other things the final appearance of the proposed water channel across the Daffodil Lawn. An existing tarmac surfaced vehicular route across the centre of the Daffodil Lawn is to be removed and replaced by an infiltration trench and grassed pedestrian footpath. A shared surface route is then proposed at the far western end of the Daffodil Lawn, away from the Mansion House. This would move vehicles away from the important Daffodil Lawn and would significantly reduce the amount of hard surfacing to the Daffodil Lawn so providing a net gain in greenery in this part of the site. This would move vehicles away from the important Daffodil Lawn and would reduce the amount of hard surfacing to the Daffodil Lawn so providing a net gain in greenery in this part of the site.

5.35 It is important to note that Officers have consistently made it clear that the attractive Union Jack forecourt to the front of the Mansion should be closed to traffic (other than in the case of access for emergency vehicles) in order to protect it. This means that any access to the Mansion House, the West Wing and The Glade for servicing/deliveries must be from the west, rather than the east and across the forecourt. Although this requires the introduction of a small area of gravel surfacing to the west of the Lawn it is considered that the benefits outweigh any concern in this respect. The applicant also proposes to restore the Union Jack forecourt and the approach to vehicle management across this.

5.36 The proposal provides ungated public access to over 12ha of open space within Trent Park, along with over 3km of walking and cycling routes that link into the Country Park. The applicants have confirmed that although there will be parts of the site which will not be accessible to the public these are restricted to those areas shown as private or communal amenity space in the submission. Condition 18 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) requires under part k) that details of all public, private and communal amenity spaces, and how access to them will be managed, are submitted to the Council for approval. Furthermore, the draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Legal Agreement includes details of public access across the site. This also allows the security of requiring a landscape management plan for the site.

5.37 As far The Glade is concerned, HE have maintained concern over this element throughout the process. Amendments have been made to The Glade which it is considered are positive and more suited to this location with the building heights and massing considered to respond better to the existing site levels. The balance here with the amendment to the northern extent of The Glade boundary is that two new publicly accessible routes through the woodland in this part of the site are now provided, along with an area of accessible open space (approx. 400 square metres). Photographic assessment of views through the adjacent woodland, as well as details of additional screen planting proposed along the site boundary, were provided as part of the updated Design & Access Statement and have helped to demonstrate to Officers that the impact of this element would be acceptable. It is acknowledged that there will be an increase in the amount of building in this part of the site and that there has been a view, including from Officers at HE, that there should be no development here. However, it is considered that it would be appropriate to take something of a pragmatic view and that the proposed site-wide development will have a major beneficial effect on the Mansion itself, as well as on Trent Park Registered Park.
and the Conservation Area. Considering the development as a whole and the benefits that it will have on the wider Park and a number of heritage assets, it is the opinion of Officers that The Glade element is, on balance, acceptable and this conclusion is not outweighed by other concerns.

Greater London Archaeological Advice Service (GLAAS)

5.38 No objection subject to condition.

Natural England

5.39 Proposal is unlikely to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes. Refer the Council to Natural England’s Standing Advice on protected species. Support the incorporation of green infrastructure into the development. Secure biodiversity enhancements such as bat roosts and bird nest boxes.

Ecology

5.40 The Council’s consultant has been involved in significant discussions with the applicant, details of which are reported elsewhere.

Sport England

5.41 Sport England is not a statutory consultee as this proposal falls outside of their remit (there is no loss of, or impact on, sports pitches). However, they initially objected to the development on the basis of the loss of the Hockey Club’s overspill car park which the Club has benefited from within the application site over the last few years.

5.42 Following further discussion, and an understanding of the site specific issues relating to the wider use of Trent Park, they withdrew this objection subject to a requirement to provide temporary overspill parking arrangements for the Hockey Club until the permanent overspill car park (which is the subject of approval ref. 16/05472/FUL) is delivered. These details are being agreed in the s106 Unilateral Undertaking.

RSPB

5.43 Members of NW London RSPB Group are concerned at what they perceive as over development of the Former Middlesex University Campus Site and insensitive remodelling of the landscape habitats which will adversely affect the wildlife of Trent Country Park. The scheme proposes a number of sustainability and ecological enhancements and this has been considered by the Council’s ecology consultant.

Enfield Archaeological Society

5.44 They emphasised the heritage significance of this location, but considered that this has been adequately considered in the planning application documentation and satisfactory proposals made to ensure that any heritage assets likely to be impacted are preserved by record.

Conservation Advisory Group (CAG)

5.45 The Group have considered this application on a number of occasions (April 2016 / July 2016 / November 2016 & March 2017) and established a sub group to facilitate more immediate engagement with the Applicant.

5.46 The comments from the Sub-Group in November 2016 are set out below (although it should be noted that the schema was subsequently amended and re-presented to CAG in March 2017 (see Para 5.49) were:
The proposal has a number of significant issues that require further design development to realise a satisfactory scheme.

The submitted scheme has been viewed by a sub-group of Enfield CAG in light of their previous minuted comments on the pre-application proposals in August 2016. The following feedback raises a number of key points that CAG consider have not been addressed satisfactorily at this stage. Furthermore, the Chair has communicated that although the Group would welcome a further presentation on the scheme from Berkeley’s and its design team now the proposals have been submitted for planning, the group is strongly of the opinion that the applicants are given opportunity to fully consider and address the points raised below before this takes place.

- The group reiterated previous requests for a greater amount of contextual information e.g. complete street views of every street within the site, a 3D model with the topography of the site overlaid with a fly through from within and beyond site.
- Although broadly comfortable with the master plan and site layout in principle, the sensitive nature of a number of views external to the site and how built form appeared on the ridge line were reiterated. The inclusion of the SUDS ponds was queried as they appeared relatively alien features within the historic landscape.
- The group were broadly comfortable with west wing in principle, although the design details of this and other elements needed to be explained further through submission of typical detail drawings.
- Turning to the walled garden, a contemporary approach had previously been supported in principle alongside an acceptance that this will be a denser developed area of the site. However, in considering this, a lack of information on the relationship to the adjoining character areas frustrated attempts to understand if this area would sit comfortably within its surroundings and provide a comfortable interface with neighbouring houses. It was also noted that the terraces were lacking symmetry in the massing arrangement and overall form.
- The apartment blocks adjacent to the Daffodil Lawn have not been subject to sufficient design development since the scheme was last reviewed in August. For example, the apartment blocks still incorporate projecting balconies on columns (raised as an objection in August). The group were keen that the Architects explore different options for these balconies and in particular, considered balconies set into the elevation, rather than projecting. There was also concern at the oblique view of new flanks from Daffodil Lawn, which lacked sufficient articulation and detail. The presence of the ramps to the underground parking fronting Daffodil Lawn was also queried as it was felt this gave too greater prominence to the vehicle and parking entrances. It was suggested that parking could be accessed from the rear, as an alternative to Daffodil lawn.
- The Glade is an improvement on previous proposals, although the group were mindful that the current site only contains a single house and were concerned at the potential visual impact of more dwellings on the wider landscape setting in this location.
- The extension to the orangerie felt heavy, of an irregular shape and insufficiently refined in design and detail. Further design development of this is element is required.
- House types. Improvements in design quality needed. The relationship between proportions and elevational treatment currently feels uncomfortable across the more traditionally designed house types
- Nissan hut near the Piggery: The group was concerned that its significance had not been explored fully and considered if it could be saved as an exhibit for the Museum.

At the meeting of CAG on 7 March, the Group considered the revised plans and additional verified views together with the model that had been prepared by Berkeley’s. The applicant provided an update on the changes that had been made to the master plan, the external changes to the houses and apartment blocks following discussion with the Council’s Urban Design and Conservation Officers and the rationale behind the Glade and SuDS strategy. There was general support in particular to the changes to the dwellings in the walled garden and other areas of the scheme) although a number of the housing typologies where identified as not having progressed sufficiently and officers were encouraged to pursue further improvements. There was also some discussion about the southern lane apartment blocks in terms of scale, height and massing; however it was confirmed that these were lower than the existing Sports Hall and would not
5.50 Concern was also expressed regarding the height of the development in terms of its impact on the views within and across the park. This point is addressed in the Analysis section below.

6. Public Consultation

6.1 A total of 5956 letters were sent to addresses advising them of the applications in October 2016. In addition, a total of 33 site notices were posted both within the Country Park, but also at entrances and routes to it on 24 October 2016.

6.2 The applications (both Planning & Listed Building Consent) were the subject of a Press Notice on 5 October 2016 advertising the proposals as Development affecting Listed Buildings, the setting of Listed Buildings, a Registered Park & Garden within the Trent Park Conservation Area.

6.3 A number of key design changes were made to the scheme as a result of consultation feedback including the following:

- Relocation of the north-eastern SUD pond and updates to the SUDs Strategy;
- Removal of proposed trees in the North Lawn area to restore the open character of the Lawn;
- Additional cycle stands for visitors to the Orangery, museum and play area;
- The re-orientation of the eastern house, plot 44, on Wisteria Drive;
- Relocation of apartment blocks on Southern Lane and two additional car parking spaces;
- New design for the Woodland Glade character area;
- Minor Changes to the external elevations of the house types and apartment buildings;
- Additional Detail on the Orangery design; and
- Alterations to the proposals for the Mansion House light-wells, retaining them in their historic positions.

6.4 In response to this a further round of public consultation, with another 5956 letters, took place in January 2017.

6.5 A total of 32 responses have been in received in relation to the consultation exercise which can be summarised below.

- Wrong to allow a housing development in the middle of the Green Belt;
- This development sets a dangerous precedent that building on Green Belt is an acceptable way forward to solve London's housing problem;
- Wrong to allow development of the site for commercial profit when it was donated to the nation by the Sassoon family;
- Source of conflict between the future residents of this development and the Council over the use of the park for major public events. The residents will undoubtedly object to these and try to put a stop to them;
- The proposed housing conflicts with the Planning Statement for Trent Park (2012);
- The housing would clearly have an impact on the openness of green belt land. This application sets dangerous precedent for green belt land;
- Whilst access will continue, the setting of adjacent areas will suffer, walking between the development site and the golf course will be an entirely different experience, much more suburban in feel and this is bound to put park users off using the area as part of a circular walk;
- The development changes the campus from being a landscape in which buildings are set to a development with landscape between. Strongly object to this housing development in Trent Park and the Green Belt;
- The application claims that traffic will not increase over that for the campus. Whilst it is difficult to dispute the figures this seems highly unlikely. Increased traffic will harm the serene nature of the park;
Whilst it would be great to see the mansion in use and some of the buildings demolished, the current application is just a sop to shoehorn in residential development;

If there must be housing surely it would be more appropriate to build less units but extremely sustainable ones, perhaps passivhaus, and with biodiverse elements as opposed to some pastiche that is presumably trying to mimic elements of the mansion, but in fact failing to tie in with the setting;

The impact on the easternmost parts of Trent Park, currently one of the quietest areas, and therefore important for ecology and wildlife will be huge;

Local roads, particularly at peak times become very congested around the Cat Hill roundabout. Bramley Road frequently chokes up and Cockfosters Road is not fit for the traffic load is carries at present as traffic is frequently nose to tail and at a standstill in both directions. The impact of an additional 262 residences (with the possibility of multi-vehicle ownership per residency), is unlikely to improve these issues;

Deeply disturbed that of the 262 proposed houses only 18 are to be "affordable". That is significantly less than 7% and should be seen in light of the London Mayors' vision for at least 35% affordable housing provision;

This is far too large a development for the location, especially in comparison with what it is replacing, namely a university campus with none of the facilities and amenities proposed. The area has seen a massive increase in developments in recent times, e.g. Bolingbroke Park, the effects of which have not yet been fully realised and therefore cannot be fully evaluated. There is a planning permission at Black Horse Tower in Cockfosters. There are no new schools in any of these proposals;

Increase in pollution is unacceptable;

The architectural styles proposed for the new dwellings are generally uninspiring, disappointing and not worthy of such a unique area in terms of modernity or complimentary character to that of the mansion house;

It is vital to point out that the general provision for parking spaces is inadequate for modern day usage and that the result will be that parked cars clog the roadways creating an urbanised chaos;

Need appropriate provision for the enclosures and visual concealment of all the waste bins;

The plans for the Walled Garden are NOT in keeping or "contextually appropriate to the setting." Ugly house plans look like brick blocks and are more in keeping with a prison. ;

No provision is being taken to protect the forest that is many hundreds of years old dating back to the 1500s or it's wildlife, flora and fauna;

No provision has been made to protect the very old apple orchard;

Affordable housing offer is unacceptable. At the final meeting for local residents (Planning Panel) the planning department advised it was the Council's policy that all new developments should offer 40% social housing;

The very ambitious response on the night was that Berkley Homes would give the council 6 million towards the enrichment of the local community in lieu of social housing. Please advise how this money will be spent to enrich the local community;

The management of heavy traffic during the 4 - 5 year build period has not been considered if the scheme goes ahead;

The pressure on the local community for schooling, healthcare & traffic congestion has not been fully considered. All local primary schools within the proposed catchment area are oversubscribed;

Securing Enfield’s heritage by ensuring the Mansion House survives is commendable however the new build apartments / houses are, in my view not in keeping with the architecture of the Mansion House and are not sympathetic to it. They lack any detailed period features, for example the windows or shape of the buildings;

Little effort has been made to blend them in with the historically important Mansion House and its architecture. The few period features seem to be token gestures, the applicants can do better and are providing a poor deal for Enfield architecturally;

The proposal does not attempt to address local housing needs. There is no shortage of three/four/five bedroom houses in the area. What is needed is social housing for hard-working, but low-earning families. The affordable homes provided do not even begin to address local needs for reasonably priced rented housing;
• The Bothy should be refurbished rather than demolished as the more original buildings that can be retained better for the whole community;
• Future occupiers of the residential units at the southern end of Snake Lane will be close to the Trent Park golf club which is allowed to stay open late and hold functions. Complaints from the residents about the lawful uses are inevitable. New residential accommodation should not be proposed here;
• This is an open space and should be left for the public to enjoy the beauty not more concrete and bricks, cars and pollution;
• The only known concession to relieve any traffic congestion at the intersection with Bramley Road and Prince George Avenue is a short extension to the Right Turn into PGA for traffic moving from the west along Bramley Road. There is in such a proposal no recognition of the increased flows seeking to turn into Snakes Lane from the east along Bramley Road (direction Enfield) and to the north from PGA crossing Bramley Road;
• Apartment block 12, occupying the site of the existing sports hall, is adjacent to Rookery Cottages. The block is at least one storey too high and has three balconies overlooking us affecting our privacy; and
• Concerns over the electricity sub-station being built between the new apartment block and our property, in terms of health impact.

6.6 An objector has commented that the Mayor of London must make the decision rather than the Council, given the sensitivity of the development of the site. This application will be referred to the Mayor of London if the Council is minded to grant planning permission in accordance with the Mayor of London Order (2008).

6.7 In support:
• Demolition of the more recent buildings and the use of the mansion house for a museum;
• Fully support the proposed development especially the provision of the museum as it will tell everyone about the vital role played by Trent Park during World War 2. This is of similar importance to that of Bletchley Park and it is essential that the nation is able to see a major part of its history; and
• Agree that new homes are needed.

6.8 Other Comments: In addition to the material planning comments received in relation to the application a number of other points have been made, some of which go well beyond the scope of what the Planning Authority can lawfully take into account when making a decision on the application. These are set down here for the sake of completeness.

- It is to be hoped that full and detailed consideration is given to the preservation of Trent Park as an historical site and that the provision for museum facilities fully reflects this. I believe it is essential therefore that the museum facilities proposed at the renovated site should be an appropriate memorial to the activities of the intelligence gatherers and should provide sufficient space to display the scope and nature of the secret work of those involved in these operations.

- The (applicants) public consultation was geared to ensure that comments were not made on the suitability or not of having housing in the scheme - the only question relating to housing asked which number of stories would be most acceptable, therefore, allowing the developer to claim positive reactions.

- Don’t believe that Enfield Council have acted within the law selling this land to a property developer as this is a National Park, a registered National Heritage Site and Green Belt. This land was originally owned by the Monarchy and Enfield Council do not have the right to sell it to a property developer.

- At the public exhibitions organised by the developers there was much reference to 'community,' however there is no provision for any community activity anywhere within the site. The swimming pool (something the area needs) will be part of a private club. When
asked about possibly providing a village or community hall or similar the response was that the developer had to make a profit. Similarly, there is no provision for a local shop nor a local pub.

**The Hockey Club Objection**

6.9 The Southgate Sports and Leisure Trust (SSLT) objected to the development in November 2016. A number of the points have subsequently been dealt with through discussions relating to the increase in hockey club parking provision (planning permission subsequently granted and the phasing of the provision of the additional spaces will be controlled through a s106 Unilateral Undertaking), whilst some of the others fall outside the remit of this planning application assessment. There has been no formal withdrawal of the Hockey Club objection even though the applicant applied for additional car parking application and this application has now been approved. Their concerns are that there was a lack of any formal agreement between the applicant and SSLT concerning the removal of half of hockey club car parking area which would not allow them to run a viable operation. They also have concerns about the future management of Snakes Lane and for the on-going costs of managing Snakes Lane, as well as during the construction phase, having uninterrupted use of Snakes Lane and all car parks. These last two points are matters for the parties to agree between themselves rather than being a matter for the Local Planning Authority.

**Trent Park Conservation Committee**

6.10 In a letter to Joanne McCartney AM at the London Assembly (March 2017), the Committee raised concerns about the traffic problems at the junction of Snakes Lane, Prince George Avenue and Bramley Road.

6.11 They feel that the access is not fit for purpose and that the additional traffic will exacerbate the problems. At peak times exiting Snakes Lane is difficult especially if turning right. The Committee have challenged the validity of the Transport Assessment for a number of reasons, including the use of historic data, the basis for the analysis of future generation and the fundamental difference, as they see it, between the characteristics of traffic associated with the University and the proposed residential development.

6.12 The plans proposed for the modifications to the Bramley Road, Snakes Lane junction will not be enough and the fact that other planning application developments are either built out, are in the process of being built out or benefit from planning permission, needs to be considered.

6.13 These specific points have been put to the Council’s Traffic & Transportation Officer who considers that the highway remarks set down later in this report have been written in the full knowledge of these concerns and that the conclusions reached are sound.

**Planning Panel**

6.14 The Planning Panel took place on 17 November 2016 at Highlands School. The Council organised this event and sent invites to local residents and stakeholders. The Panel was attended by a number of Councillors as well as Officers. Members are familiar with the purpose of the Panel, to receive a briefing on the proposals from the applicant, to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the application.

6.15 Minutes were prepared by the Council following the Panel and are appended to this report.

**7. Relevant Policy**

7.1 The London Plan

| Policy 3.3 | Increasing housing supply |
| Policy 3.4 | Optimising housing potential |
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.6 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing
Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets
Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing
Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
Policy 3.14 Existing housing
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.8 Innovative energy technologies
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
Policy 6.3 Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 7.9 Heritage-led regeneration
Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 7.18 Protecting open space and addressing deficiency
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

7.2 Local Plan: Core Strategy

CP2: Housing supply and locations for new homes
CP3: Affordable housing
CP4: Housing quality
CP5: Housing types
CP9: Supporting community cohesion
CP13: Promoting economic prosperity
CP16: Taking part in economic success and improving skills
CP18: Delivering shopping provision across Enfield
CP20: Sustainable energy use and energy infrastructure
CP21: Delivering sustainable water supply, drainage and sewerage infrastructure
CP22: Delivering sustainable waste management
CP24: The road network
CP25: Pedestrians and cyclists
CP26: Public transport
CP28: Managing flood risk through development
CP30: Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment
CP31: Built and landscape heritage
CP32: Pollution
CP36: Biodiversity
7.3 Development Management Document

DMD1 Affordable Housing on Sites Capable of Providing 10 Units or More
DMD3 Providing a Mix of Different Sized Homes
DMD6 Residential Character
DMD8 General Standards for New Residential Development
DMD9 Amenity Space
DMD10 Distancing
DMD37 Achieving High Quality Design-Led Development
DMD38 Design Process
DMD44 Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets
DMD45 Parking Standards
DMD47 New Roads, Access and Servicing
DMD48 Transport Assessments
DMD49 Sustainable Design and Construction Statements
DMD50 Environmental Assessment Methods
DMD51 Energy Efficiency Standards
DMD53 Low and Zero Carbon Technology
DMD54 Allowable Solutions
DMD55 Use of Roof Space / Vertical Surfaces
DMD56 Heating and Cooling
DMD57 Responsible Sourcing of Materials
DMD58 Water Efficiency
DMD59 Avoiding and Reducing Flood Risk
DMD60 Assessing Flood Risk
DMD61 Managing Surface Water
DMD65 Air Quality
DMD68 Noise
DMD69 Light Pollution
DMD70 Water Quality
DMD72 Open Space Provision
DMD73 Children’s Play Space
DMD78 Nature Conservation
DMD79 Ecological Enhancements
DMD81 Landscaping

7.4 Other Relevant Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance
LBE S106 SPD (2016)
Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010
Trent Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015)
Trent Park Conservation Area Management Proposals (2015)
Enfield Characterisation Study
Enfield Council Tall Buildings Study
Monitoring Report and Housing Trajectory 2015 (2016)
Technical Housing Standards – Nationally described space standards

8 Analysis

8.1 Principle of Residential Development

Green Belt - Policy Considerations

a) Redevelopment of a Major Developed Site (MDS) within the Green Belt
8.2 In assessing the current application within the context of green belt, several paragraphs of the NPPF are of relevance:

i) Paragraph 79: “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”.

ii) The aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land open and an essential characteristic of Green Belt is recognised as its ‘openness’.

iii) Green Belt serves five purposes (Para 80):
- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

8.3 Paragraph 80 further expands upon the policy objective aim of ‘preventing urban sprawl: “Once Green Belts have been defined, LPA’s should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land” (Para.81, NPPF).

8.4 London Plan (2015) Policy 7.16 ‘Green Belt’ notes that “the strongest protection should be given to London’s Green Belt, in accordance with national guidance. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Development will be supported if it is appropriate and helps secure the objectives of improving the Green Belt as set out in national guidance.”

8.5 Under NPPF paragraph 87 states that: ‘As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

8.6 The NPPF goes on to expand upon ‘very special circumstances’ in paragraph 88: ‘When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations’. To be ‘clearly outweighed’ implies well beyond in balance.

b) Enfield’s Major Developed Site in the Green Belt

8.7 National policy no longer recognises Major Developed Sites (MDS) in Green Belt and the adopted Core Strategy predates revisions via the NPPF. However, Enfield’s DMD Policy 89 advocates a differential approach when considering redevelopment of the two Major Developed Sites within the Borough (Trent Park and Picketts Lock). In these instances the sites have been identified as major redevelopment opportunities reflecting local significance. Further infilling would not be considered an appropriate way forward and the complete redevelopment of these sites is, therefore, in principle supported.

8.8 The Council’s approach on the designation is consistent with NPPF policy in that partial or complete redevelopment proposals can be considered. The Council’s policy in Core Strategy Policy 33 and DMD 89 identifies the former Trent Park campus as a major redevelopment opportunity, subject to proposals being guided by an appropriate assessment of extent and
impact through the additional requirement that any such proposals be considered within the context of an appropriate masterplan for the site as a whole.

8.9 The construction of new buildings is limited to volume and footprint, and the alteration and extension of existing buildings will be a complex balance ensuring the sense of openness of Green Belt is enhanced with minimal visual impact. The approx. 18% uplift in built footprint also needs to be considered in respect of the enhancement to the setting of heritage assets. The proposal covers more development across the whole site and albeit the individual footprints of new buildings are more sympathetic within the landscape setting, and smaller in scale than those previously associated with the education blocks, the impact of a spread of development on this sensitive site still requires a careful judgement against whether there is any more harm to the Green Belt than what is already on the site.

8.10 It should be noted that the GLA in their Stage 1 response conclude that the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of Green Belt overall and would in their view significantly enhance openness in key areas of the site, particularly in the setting of the Grade II Listed Mansion House. This view is one shared by Officers for the reasons expanded upon later in this report.

c) Alternative Uses to Education

8.11 The Council’s 2012 Trent Park Planning Statement was prepared to help guide future investors on the proper and appropriate planning of the whole site. The Statement established a list of appropriate/compatible alternative uses beyond education in recognition that if properly evidenced, the site may no longer be required for educational use. The applicant has produced an Alternative Uses Report (AUR) which has assessed in detail eight uses from a residential-led scheme to a high-end sport and leisure scheme and a combination of a compatible mix uses. The applicant has provided a comprehensive assessment of a range of future options to conclude that a residential-led scheme with public access to the Mansion House through a D1 community use to include museum with event space and an ancillary café is the most appropriate way forward to secure the long term protection and enhancement of both the site’s built and landscape heritage. Officers are satisfied that the assessment undertaken by the applicants is sufficiently thorough and demonstrates that it would be reasonable to allow the loss of the educational use from the Trent Park site.

8.12 One of the considerations as far as an educational use is concerned is that, whilst it is true to say that relatively recently, the University occupied the buildings on the site, it is very evident that the existing structures would not be suitable for a modern, forward-looking education use, given the state of the buildings and the clear limitations that the re-use of those buildings would have for pupils in the future. The accessibility of the site for pedestrians is a further consideration which weighs against the idea of the site being given over to a new primary or secondary school.

8.13 The Borough has an existing need to achieve and exceed a current housing target of an additional 798 units a year. Existing London Plan and Local Plan Policy assumes this will be realised through brownfield capacity, through intensification and sensitive renewal of existing residential areas, especially in areas of good public transport accessibility. The delivery of new residential units on this MDS in the Green Belt is supported by national, London Plan and Local Plan policy in terms of both increasing housing supply and optimising housing potential.

Education Need

8.14 As an existing educational site the London Plan seeks to encourage and give positive consideration to New educational facilities, (Policy 3.18). Furthermore, the London Plan in Policy 4.10: New and Emerging Economic Sectors, places emphasis on boroughs giving strong support to higher and further educational institutions and other relevant innovation and research agencies
8.15 Current policy objectives therefore, place strong protection on community facilities. The London Plan is also clear on safeguarding land in educational use for future educational provision. The site had previously worked well as an educational institution and the adopted Trent Park Planning Statement recognised it could conceivably continue to do so. Further, the London Plan encourages higher education institutions (HEI) and further education establishments to work with boroughs to plan to meet future need.

8.16 The Council has itself considered the site for its own education needs and whilst there is a continuing need for primary and secondary places across the Borough, it is not in this particular location especially given its poor access to public transport and the development of other more suitable developments to meet the need. Therefore, across the Borough there is no immediate local authority need for continuing educational use of the current nature and this is confirmed by submissions made by the Applicant on this issue following discussion with the Council’s Education Service.

8.17 In light of the Council’s Core Strategy and S106 SPD both of which require the loss of an education and employment generating use to be heavily justified and mindful of this, it is considered that the location and the accessibility of the site are sufficient justification for an alternative use.

Heritage at Risk

8.18 A key objective in the acceptability of any development proposal for his site is the ability of it to safeguard the future of the Grade II listed Mansion and sustain necessary improvements to the Mansion Terrace which is on English Heritage’s at Risk Register. The Council seeks to improve the setting of the Mansion and of the Long Garden. The 2006 Character Appraisal identifies those buildings that impair and are intrusive to the respective settings of both. With regard to the Mansion, these are the 1960/70’s Buildings named Bevan, Jebb and the students union block. Regarding the Long Garden, the music school obstructs important vistas, it also has a negative impact and its removal is encouraged.

8.19 The Council’s governing aspiration for the future of the campus set out in the adopted Planning Statement, is the ability of any future occupier to continue to protect its future preservation and continued improvement without detriment to its historic character. It is considered this is a significant material factor to be weighed when considering the principle of the proposed residential use.

Loss of Employment

8.20 Through local plan policy, there is a strong commitment to protecting jobs, and while the employment element of the Campus has its origins in educational use, the current use is also viewed as employment premises, delivering as it did a range of skilled and non-skilled positions. Core Policy 13 seeks to protect Enfield’s employment offer and this was an objective set out in the adopted Planning Statement wherein, an employment led development was the preferred approach.

8.21 Unfortunately, the marketing of the premises prior to its purchase by the Applicant did not reveal any interest from a developer promoting an employment led solution. This was scrutinised through the cross-party Trent Park working group and although regrettable, it is considered the weight assigned to the need to safeguard and improve the heritage assets and landscape, is of sufficient merit to offset this loss of employment. This will also be mitigated against, in accordance with the Council’s adopted Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document but it should be noted that the use of the site as proposed will also generate employment, both temporary during construction (137 net additional jobs) and the operation of the site including jobs associated with the museum, café and estate management (16 net additional jobs).

8.22 Taking into consideration the aforementioned factors, it is therefore considered that in principle a residential led development is acceptable.
Housing Need

8.23 The provision of good quality housing is key to improving and maintaining growth and the quality of life for Enfield residents and there is a recognised need for the Borough to provide additional residential dwellings. This development would contribute to the supply of these additional units.

Housing Types / Mix / Density

8.24 Core Policy 5 and DMD 3 Housing Types establish the following:

- Market housing – 20% 1 and 2 bed flats (1-3 persons), 15% 2 bed houses (4 persons),
  45% 3 bed houses, (5-6 persons), 20% 4+ bed houses (6+ persons).
- Social/Affordable rented housing - 20% 1 bed and 2 bed units (1-3 persons), 20% 2 bed units (4 persons) 30% 3 bed units (5-6 persons), 30% 4+ bed units (6+ persons).

8.25 The policy target is a Borough-wide target and the Council will seek a range of housing types in the intermediate sector, including affordable homes for families. The mix of intermediate housing sizes will be determined on a site by site basis and the Council will work with developers and other partners to agree an appropriate mix taking into account a range of factors including development viability and the affordability of potential users. From the indicative mix given the percentages being achieved are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>No. of Apartments</th>
<th>No. of Houses</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full schedule is:

8.26 The mix proposed is in accordance with the policy and given the site characteristics, achieving a higher proportion of family homes is to be supported given that this reflects the findings of the Council’s 2010 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) on which the Core Strategy targets were based. 59% of the proposed units within the development are 3 bed or above and, therefore, most suitable for families (total number-154). For the information of Members, 80% of these are houses and 20% are apartments. Officers consider that this is a significant benefit of the scheme.

Affordable Housing and Vacant Building Credit

8.27 Core Policy 3 of the Core Strategy and DMD1 set the affordable housing policy for the Borough. With reference to “Affordable housing on sites capable of providing 10 units or more” DMD1 developments should provide the maximum amount of affordable housing having regard to the borough-wide target of 40% and the need to provide an appropriate mix of tenures to meet local housing need and reflect a borough wide mix of 70% social/affordable rent and 30% intermediate. By way of background in November 2016 Enfield adopted the Section 106 Planning Contributions SPD. The adopted SPD reflects national policy in the NPPG by allocating a floor space credit which is deducted from the affordable housing liability of vacant buildings being
returned to active use or redeveloped i.e. the SPD supports the application of Vacant Building Credit in the Borough.

8.28 As referenced elsewhere, the London Mayor’s Draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPG is now published for public consultation. The draft SPG sets out the Mayor’s approach to the national Vacant Building Credit (VBC) policy. The GLA note that the intention of the Government’s policy is to bring forward sites containing vacant buildings which would not otherwise come forward for development. However, London is unique as such sites come forward for development and affordable housing requirements are already subject to viability testing. The Mayor’s view is that in most circumstances in London it will not be appropriate to apply the Vacant Building Credit.

8.29 The Mayor’s 1st Stage response to the planning application from last October reflects the above position.

Viability

8.30 Affordable housing aside, the issue of understanding the scheme’s deliverability and overall obligations and requirements has been clarified throughout the application process. Officers have consistently indicated that the applicant should provide the Council with an understanding of the costs associated with development and restoration elements of the scheme, given that it would allow all parties to weigh in the overall balance the range of costs that would need to be expended as part of the development. Having an appreciation over costs also allows further consideration to be given to the design approach proposed and quantum of built development across the site.

8.31 This information has now been provided in a useful form that quantifies the costs of the range of, in some case significant, works (including heritage and site restoration works) that are proposed across the site and allows for due consideration as required by Enfield’s adopted Local Plan, the S106 SPD and the Mayor’s draft SPG of Affordable Housing and Viability. A scheme as complex as this needs to be fully understood by decision makers to enable an informed process and this can only be achieved if the Council can fully appreciate the level of costs associated with the restoration of the heritage assets, the landscape and the community and public infrastructure elements. This is now the situation here meaning that Officers feel able to consider the merits of the development.

Affordable Housing

8.32 Since the submission of the planning application, discussions have been on-going between the Applicant, the Council and the GLA in relation to the viability of the proposed development and the amount of affordable housing that can be sustained of the former Middlesex University Campus, Trent Park.

8.33 As originally submitted, the proposals included the delivery of 18 affordable units (split 70:30 as 13x social rented and 5x intermediate) equating to 7% by unit or 5% by habitable room. With the application of the Vacant Building Credit (VBC), this equated to the delivery of 40% affordable units based on the uplift in floor space on site. The applicant contends that this use of Vacant Building Credit is consistent with NPPG (i.e. policy compliant) and Officers have acknowledged this position. Although it remains Berkeley’s position that VBC applies to this site, this is not accepted by the GLA whose draft SPD on Viability and Affordable Housing was published in November 2016 wherein it is the Mayor’s opinion the application of VBC in a London context, will not be appropriate in most instances.

8.34 In light of concerns regarding the low level of affordable housing, and notwithstanding the investment in heritage and landscape restoration, the viability of the development has been reviewed by the GLA and LBE on two occasions. The first review undertaken by Gerald Eve concluded in February 2017 that the scheme could not afford to provide more affordable housing than the original offer. However, following discussions, in March 2017 the applicant increased the offer to 37 homes (14% by unit or 10% by habitable room) with the additional units within intermediate tenure. Further analysis was undertaken by Gerald Eve and it was acknowledged that the enhanced offer would not achieve an acceptable level of return from the scheme. At the
request of the GLA, BNP Paribas was appointed to conduct a second review of the viability information and they also concluded that this was the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing.

The final outcome of these detailed discussions is that the amount of affordable housing is being increased from 18 affordable units to a total of 58 intermediate (shared ownership) units, comprising 22% of the total 262 units on site (20% by habitable room). The 58 shared ownership units are to comprise a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments, with two 3 bedroom apartments. The mix of unit sizes in the Southern Lane apartments blocks has been altered through internal reconfiguration, including the conversion of 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 3 bed to 2 x 2 bed homes in Block 13 and the conversion of 3 x 1 bed and 3 x 3 bed homes to 6 x 2 bed homes in Block 12, along with some alterations to the units in buildings B1 and B2 (the Daffodil Lawn apartments) to address these requirements. In addition, there has been some internal reconfiguration of the shared ownership apartments to ensure the layouts of the kitchen/dining and living rooms meet the requirements of registered providers.

8.36 Although there has been no formal response from the GLA to this offer, officers have indicated this would be supported through the Stage 2 referral process. Officers have therefore secured a significant increase in the level of affordable housing through negotiation with the applicant.

8.37 With reference to this proposal, while the provision of 58 affordable units is welcomed, further discussions are taking place regarding the precise detail as to how this number of units could be delivered to best serve the housing needs of the Borough. An update will be provided to members at the meeting.

8.38 The inclusion of a museum / event space within the Mansion House alongside a café delivers a key objective of providing public access to the Grade II Listed building. The D2 leisure (gym) component at the Orangery and the restoration of the swimming pool are supported as is the restoration of the tennis courts. The gym and swimming pool are for residents for the majority of the year (with some public access on bank holidays) to be secured in the s106 Agreement but it is considered can also be considered as part of the scheme’s community infrastructure provision. The operation of the tennis courts is unclear at this stage, but the applicant has indicated that they are considering options for a public tennis club.

8.39 Officers have been able to appreciate in greater detail the community infrastructure position above and this forms part and parcel of the overarching social and community infrastructure requirements the scheme is obligated to deliver.

Heritage Considerations

Statutory background

8.40 Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“Listed Buildings Act”) confirm that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting (s.66) and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area (s.72). As confirmed by the Court of Appeal (Civil Division), the decision in Barnwell Manor Wind
Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council [2014] EWCA Civ 137, it was concluded that where an authority finds that a development proposal would harm the setting of a listed building or the character and appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm “considerable importance and weight”. Further case law has reconfirmed the Barnwell decision and the considerations to be undertaken by a planning authority: The Forge Field Society & Ors, R v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin), Pugh v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 3 (Admin).

**National Guidance**

**8.41** Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“Conserving and enhancing the historic environment”) advises Local Planning Authorities to recognise heritage assets as an “irreplaceable resource” and to “conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance” (para. 126). Paragraph 132 goes on to say LPAs need to consider whether a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset. Proposals that lead to substantial harm to or a total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or it meets with the test identified at paragraph 133. Where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (para. 134). The NPPF states that heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the Local Planning Authority (including local listing) as stated in Appendix 2.

**8.42** At paragraph 137, LPAs are also advised to look for opportunities for new developments within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to better reveal their significance. Where a proposal preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. The NPPG advises that the extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which the asset is experienced is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

**8.43** Paragraph 135 provides guidance in relation to non-designated heritage assets. The development proposal must also be assessed against the significance of the heritage asset, and “a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset”.

**8.44** In addition, at paragraph 137, LPAs are also advised to look for opportunities for new developments within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to better reveal their significance. Where a proposal preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.

**8.45** London Plan policy 7.8 (“Heritage Assets and Archaeology”) advises what boroughs should do at a strategic level to identify, preserve, and enhance London’s heritage assets. Policy CP31 (“Built and Landscape Heritage”) of the Core Strategy sets out a requirement that development should conserve and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy DMD44 (“Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets”) states that development which fails to conserve and enhance the special interest, significance or setting of a heritage asset will be refused. The design, materials and detailing of development affecting heritage assets or their setting should conserve the asset in a manner appropriate to its significance.

**8.46** The heritage assets upon which the impact of the development should be considered against are the Trent Park Conservation Area and the various listed features referenced elsewhere in this report. What must therefore be determined is whether any of the elements proposed will harm the significance of the heritage assets, having regard to the statutory requirement to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a
conservation area (s.72). If any harm is identified, great weight must be given to that harm. Further to this, as advised above, if substantial harm or total loss to significance is identified, it would need to be established whether there are any substantial public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm or loss or the tests identified at para.133 of the NPPF are met. If there is less than substantial harm, the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, and for undesignated heritage assets, a balanced judgement must be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. It should be noted that benefits are not limited to heritage benefits but to all material planning benefits capable of meeting the policy tests.

8.47 For the information of Members the significance of the Trent Park Conservation Area derives from the following:

- Its historic association with the Enfield Chase, a hunting park attached to the manor of Enfield;
- Half of the total area is grade II listed on the Register of Parks and Gardens of historic interest;
- The topography continues to play a dominant role in determining the distinctiveness of the conservation area;
- The historic integrity of the estate has largely been preserved;
- The estate retains evidence of layers of change resulting from successive ownerships, uses, functions, and fashions; and
- Trees remain a very important element.

8.48 The detailed application includes full information relating to building siting and footprints, heights, design, appearance and access arrangements. An Environmental Statement includes an assessment of the built heritage, historic landscape assessment and Landscape and visual impact assessment. The overall Masterplan has adopted a comprehensive approach to ensure that the Trent Park site is developed in an attractive and unified manner, at the same time removing the existing unattractive, piecemeal former University buildings. The application includes a wealth of information that has allowed Officers to conclude that the development would have the necessary design quality that would serve to pass the Conservation Area “test”. In doing so the application has taken account of the role of the site in the wider context of the historic parkland and provides for a framework for the restoration and enhancement of both the landscape, as well as the existing heritage assets on the site.

8.49 In this case, the retention of almost all of the buildings on the site that have a high design quality or architectural and historic merit (the exception is the Bothy which is being demolished) means that planning policy is met. The retention of the Mansion, with the Jebb building removed, the Stable Block and the Orangery, with the music block removed, will restore their settings and is of notable benefit. At the same time, the removal of the post-war buildings, in particular Bevan, Gubbay, Jebb and the music block, would significantly enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Many of these buildings are currently sited in the area in proximity to the Mansion House, meaning that the setting of the House itself, Orangery and Stable Block, in particular, would be significantly enhanced and improved by the removal of these buildings which are considered to detract from the Conservation Area. Officers have been clear throughout the process that the existence of these larger unattractive buildings does not, in itself, justify their replacement with equally large, but more attractive, buildings and this is something that the applicants have taken into consideration through the evolution of their scheme.

8.50 The Bothy is a non-designated heritage asset in the designated Trent Park Conservation Area. As a modest, utilitarian Estate building it makes a small positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area. The applicants have explored whether it would be possible to retain the building through amendments to the master plan but this would result in the loss of several new homes and compromises to the layout of the scheme. The building is also in a poor condition and would require extensive repair and modification works. The loss of the Bothy as a non-designated heritage asset needs be weighed in the wider balance of material planning considerations. In relation to the designated asset, its demolition would result in a small degree of less than
substantial harm to the conservation area. In both cases, and giving special weight to the latter consideration, there would be a range of public benefits, including heritage benefits arising from the delivery of the master plan. On this basis, and taking into account the overall benefits of the development, officers consider that the loss of the Bothy is justified.

8.51 Having regard to the statutory requirement to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area (s.72) the proposal has been assessed against the identified heritage asset as set out above. It is considered that the development proposals will not lead to any harm to the designated or undesignated heritage assets and would provide beneficial effect to these assets and their setting having regard to Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, Core Policy 31, Policy DMD44 of the Development Management Document, and with section 12 of the NPPF. The development proposals must therefore now be assessed against any other material considerations, in accordance with s.38(6) of the 2004 Act and s.70(2) of the T&CPA 1990.

8.52 In the consultation section above it is evident that Historic England Officers have been involved throughout the evolution of the scheme, both in historic building terms, but also from a point of view of acknowledging the sensitivity and importance of the landscape within Trent Park. Historic England have over time raised a number of issues with regards the submission the majority of which have been responded to by the applicants. Officers have considered the remaining matters, including the reservations about The Glade element of the development. It is considered that taking into account the significant heritage benefits that the proposal will deliver, on balance, they outweigh any remaining concerns raised by HE, particularly given the draft conditions and proposed Heads of Terms that will allow the details of the wider development to be controlled.

Landscape and Visual Assessment

8.53 As set out above, one of the critical considerations in the overall assessment of the development proposals, given the Green Belt location and the sensitivities of the site, is an understanding of the impact that they would have on a number of strategic views around the site. As a result, a comparison of these views both before and after the buildings are erected is a fundamental part of the wider assessment here.

8.54 In response to this point, a full landscape and visual impact assessment has been prepared as part of the Environmental Statement. The assessment identifies a number of significant beneficial landscape and visual effects associated with the development, relating to the removal of the existing University buildings, which detract from the character and appearance of the historic designed landscape and parkland, together with the conservation, restoration and refurbishment of the historic landscape and buildings.

8.55 The visual assessment, and the supporting rendered views and visualisations, demonstrate that development will not increase the visibility of built form within the site and in views from the surrounding area. The assessment also demonstrates that the character and appearance of the site will be enhanced primarily as a consequence of the removal of the former University buildings and the garden restoration which will serve to re-create the historic landscape setting of Trent Park.

8.56 The series of 22 representative viewpoints have been prepared by specialists Millerhare and are visually verified. Officers from Enfield and Historic England were given the opportunity to see how Millerhare undertook their assessment and consequently how confidence in the verification exercise was possible. The views contain a mix of wireline images (which show the existing and proposed buildings in outline only) and fully rendered (photorealistic) images in which the proposed buildings on the development are shown superimposed on photographs.

8.57 As a result of the further consultation undertaken, it was agreed that an additional set of representative views should be prepared. These were discussed and agreed with Officers and Historic England. 9 additional views were selected. Again, these images are verified and combine a mix of wireline and rendered views. The purpose of the views was two-fold:
• “To test the likely visibility of new development in views from within the application site and in the immediate setting or foreground of heritage assets
• To assess the appearance of new build elements, both in juxtaposition with other aspects of the development proposals and in the context of the historic buildings and landscape”.

8.58 For the information of Members, the Trent Park Golf Club as part of their objection to the southern-most element of the proposal have stated that they believe that the additional buildings adjacent to the minibus turning area will have an unacceptable visual impact on this part of the Green Belt. This is not a view that is shared by Officers.

8.59 In conclusion, the proposed overall effects on the character of the landscape are considered to be, on balance, beneficial, largely because of the landscape and heritage led approach to the proposals and the conservation and restoration of the principal elements of the historic designed landscape and tree cover within the site. It is recognised that the proposals will deliver benefits to the historic landscape of Trent Park, through the conservation and restoration of the gardens and parkland and the refurbishment of the buildings and structures at the heart of the park. The visual assessment has confirmed that, although it is inevitable that the introduction of the quantum of development envisaged here will mean that there will be a change in the character of the locality, that change will overall be a beneficial one and the development will not have a greater impact on views than the existing buildings and on this basis the scheme can be supported in this respect.

8.60 Members will be very aware of a well-supported local campaign relating to the future use of the Mansion building with particular reference to recognising the role that Trent Park played in the Second World War. The Trent Park Museum Trust has been formed in order to assist in this recognition. The applicant has taken account of this campaign in the evolution of its proposals and produced an “Outline Concept and Business Case” document that was submitted as part of the application proposals.

8.61 As discussed elsewhere, the proposal involves the restoration and refurbishment of the Mansion and the removal of the existing unsightly buildings originally built as part of the former University buildings. In doing so this enables public access to, and use of, the Mansion House for the first time in its history with a long-term sustainable museum, café and events space which is something that the Trust have been keen to secure.

8.62 The scope of the Business Case was to consider how a new Museum, set within the Historic Mansion House, might work. The applicant has indicated that the project seeks to:

• “Create a viable and sustainable cultural experience.
• Preserve the heritage and celebrate the history of the Mansion House and grounds.
• Appeal to a range of audiences and connect a wide range of stakeholders.
• Provide dynamic and experiential displays that bring history to life”.

8.63 The redevelopment provides the opportunity to tell the story of the Mansion in its original context with part of the ground floor and basement accessible to the public for the first time with an exhibition space dedicated to celebrating the exceptional features of the grounds, the Mansion House, and the events that occurred there.

8.64 Although the Mansion has evidently had a very interesting history, at the core of the proposed Museum is the opportunity to interpret Trent Park’s history through spoken word. The details of how this will happen will be clarified in due course and are not something that the Planning Authority needs to be involved with, certainly at this stage, but reference has been made that in order to learn the value of information transferred between the visitors, listening points could be located in the grounds where bugging devices were placed in the Second World War. The conversations that took place could be dramatized in several ways, through live interaction with
the host, the Audio Visual (AV) experience, listening points and an audio interactive guide, but
that is detail for future considerations.

8.65 Whilst the attraction of, and local support for, establishing “Trent Park-The Listening Museum” is
understood for the reasons set out above, it is important to acknowledge that there is not a
specific planning reason to insist on the provision of such a museum over and above any other
form of community facility. Other uses have therefore been considered by the applicants in their
Alternative Use Assessment, some of which would also provide a viable use for the museum that
would meet the community needs of the Borough, and there is nothing in planning terms that
would allow the Local Planning Authority to insist on the provision of this particular museum.

8.66 However, this is something of an academic point because Officers have consistently encouraged
the applicants to actively consider the aspirations of the Trust (which it has been happy to do) and
this museum is something that the Planning Authority can support.

8.67 It is understood that a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) has been entered into between the
applicant and the Trust to set out a framework by which the museum could be brought forward.
Within this MoU, the applicant has agreed to carry out works to bring the space up to a standard
whereby the Trust could then fit it out as a museum. The Trust is required to provide a detailed
Business Plan to the applicant for approval in consultation with the local planning authority. Once
this Business Plan has been approved, an agreement for lease will be entered into between the
applicant and the Trust, with the lease being granted following completion of the applicant's
works and approval by the applicant of the Trust's proposed fit out works.

Residential Design Standards

8.68 Members will be aware that minimum space standards for new development are set down in
Policy 3.5 of the Mayor’s London Plan. The purpose of this is to ensure that new homes are
adequately sized, with room layouts which are well laid out, functional and fit for purpose. In this
case, the proposed development will deliver all 262 units in accordance with, or in excess of,
these space standards in full compliance with the London Plan.

8.69 The applicants have confirmed that the detailed design of the houses and apartments has been
designed to take account of the Mayor’s Housing SPG (2016), London Housing Design Guide
and it will also meet Lifetime Homes. All dwellings will receive good levels of daylight and sunlight
due to the site layout which is a reflection of the relatively low density development discussed
elsewhere.

8.70 In addition to the internal space proposed for the dwellings within the development, there is also
sufficient external amenity space to meet the likely demands of future residents. The proposal
incorporates communal and private amenity space in accordance with London Mayor and Enfield
standards, as set down in Policy DMD 9. There would be a total of 740 square metres of on-site
communal amenity space that will only be available to existing residents and will benefit from
good levels of surveillance.

8.71 In relation to private amenity space, this will be provided either by private gardens and/or
balconies/terraces. The development has been designed so that each unit will exceed the
Mayor’s minimum standard of 5 square metres for 1 or 2 person dwellings along with an extra 1
square metre for each additional occupant. In terms of the houses, each of them will significantly
exceed this guidance meaning that a combination of the quantity, and quality, of internal space
and the external amenity area will ensure that the future residents all benefit from excellent
quality accommodation.

8.72 The private and communal external amenity areas must also be seen in the context of the wider
site whereby over 12 hectares of public amenity space will be made available for people, both
from within this development and elsewhere, to benefit from including over 3km of walking/cycling
routes which will connect to the wider Trent Country Park.
As far as child play space is concerned, the London Mayor’s child yield calculator has been used to generate the child yield from the development of a total of 134 children. Across the age groups, in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.6 and the Mayor’s Supplementary Planning Guidance Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation, this generates a need for 1,340sqm of play space. This quantum is exceeded (1,490sqm) and delivered on site with a core area for 5-11 year olds and 12+ (the ‘Copse Play Area’), as well as spaces for under 5s designated within the development as ‘Oak Walk’, ‘South Lawn’ and ‘Copse’ play areas. The applicants have been keen to emphasise that these spaces have been designed to be appropriate to their historic landscape setting using natural elements and timber play equipment. These spaces are acceptable in terms of quantity and quality and there are clearly significant wider opportunities for incidental play on the site and in the surrounding Country Park.

Impact on Trees

The Council’s Tree Officer has been heavily involved throughout the planning process in the discussions relating to the development of the site and, as indicated above, is able to support the scheme. He feels that when considered as a whole, the development provides many significant benefits and enhancements when compared to what is existing in terms of arboricultural amenity and biodiversity. Although it is acknowledged that there is a reasonably high number of trees being proposed to be removed across the site, the overwhelming majority of these are trees of low arboricultural amenity or ecological merit. The ‘woodland glade’ area where there are proposed to be 4 detached houses sited towards the west boundary is not considered by the Tree Officer to actually be a woodland, although it is adjacent to woodland outside of the site. It is made up of trees from the overgrown garden of the previous caretakers cottage and some other self-sown trees and scrubland. There are few significant trees in this area, and those that are significant are being retained. The area is to be planted and landscaped to the benefit of the site, consequently there is no objection to this element of the proposal.

Careful consideration has also been given to the existing trees across the wider site to retain the best specimens that will provide significant long-term benefit to the site and provide mitigation to those trees removed. This approach will provide a comprehensive landscape scheme across the wider site that will plant many good quality trees, and the Councils Tree Officer believes that this will provide far more amenity and ecological benefit in the long-term than is existing.

He also adds that the trees, woodlands and other landscape features on the site will be actively managed so that the benefits they provide are maximized and areas of the site do not fall into a ‘derelict’ state of relatively poor value as has occurred over many years whilst under the stewardship of the previous educational establishments that have been responsible for the site in recent years.

The site layout and retention of the retained trees has been carefully considered and their constraints respected so that there are no foreseeable significant post-development issues regarding the trees and proposed development. The applicant has fully recognised the importance of ensuring the retention and long-term protection of such trees, in order to assist in mitigating any impact arising from the residential development envisaged. It is considered that the proposed landscaping, the additional tree planting, alongside the commitment from the applicant to manage the site with arboricultural issues a key component of the development is very encouraging, in terms of the long-term sustainable development of Trent Park. The Golf Club have objected to the proposed changes to landscaping at the southern end of Snakes Lane as part of their more specific concerns about the proposed new buildings. Their observations have been shared with the Council’s Tree Officer who has re-affirmed their overall view that the proposal is acceptable for the reasons set down above.

Ecology

Following on from the assessment of the Tree Officer above, it is unsurprising given the characteristics of Trent Park there has also been much work undertaken on the possible Ecological Impact of the proposed development on the site. It is likely that the proposals will have
some effects on protected and priority species, priority habitats and on Trent Park Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC). The comments of the local RSPB group in this regard are noted. In terms of the consideration of the planning application it is considered that these effects can be minimised, providing that the necessary detailed information on baseline conditions and the impacts of the proposals are available to be assessed. Consultants employed by the Council have been in discussions with the applicants and these discussions have resulted in further detailed information being provided in order to allow the Planning Authority to assess the proposals. The most recent submission on behalf of the applicants sets out how the comments on the scheme made by the Council have been addressed within the detailed design of the Masterplan and confirms where the relevant information and assessment is provided in the submission documents. The Council’s consultants state that the revised documents that have been submitted address most of the concerns raised. Officers feel that, particularly given the long-standing aspirations for the site as set down in previous Planning documents so that development along the lines of the Masterplan proposed here would always be likely to come forward in some form, alongside the range of environmental enhancements that the applicant has proposed, means that Officers now consider that the additional work undertaken on the site-wide Ecological issues supports a pragmatic approach to the development of Trent Park whilst at the same time, by necessity, employing the precautionary principle to what is being proposed. This conclusion can be read alongside the views, and support, of the Tree Officer set out above.

8.79 Much work has been done on this particular issue so as to reach agreement on the majority of impacts of the development with, for the avoidance of doubt, the following areas which have been subject to further consideration.

1. *Impact of the proposals on Trent Park Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (SMINC)*

The applicants consider that there will be no adverse impacts on those parts of the Trent Park SMINC located outside the planning application boundary and that the measures which they have committed to deliver through the Landscape Masterplan and the Landscape Restoration and Future Management Strategy (to be secured through the S106 Agreement in consultation with LBE Parks) will adequately mitigate the effect of any additional recreational use associated with the proposed development on the nature conservation value of the SMINC. The balancing act to be struck here is that a development of 262 dwellings within the boundary of the SMINC will be bound to have an impact on it, and residents may be more likely to use the wider park than visitors to it, but the matter is whether that impact would be sufficiently detrimental to justify refusing consent.

Significant monies are proposed through the S106 Agreement in accordance with the Council’s adopted Planning Obligations SPD towards education, health, libraries etc. including £83,185 towards ‘community facilities’. The applicants state that the Council could decide that some of these monies should be used by the Parks Department for works to the wider Trent Park (e.g.: improved network of paths, new litter and dog waste bins, etc.). This is something that would be at the discretion of the Council whether to use any part of the S106 financial contributions for this purpose.

2. *Habitats*

It is acknowledged that there will be some unavoidable loss of ‘priority habitats’ as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and/or London and Enfield Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitats because of the development. The Council’s Tree Officer has expressed support for the proposal in relation to this issue, which has been subject to an Arboricultural survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The application commits to the planting of a total of 433 trees, the majority of which are native deciduous species across the wider site, managed in the long-term for both their biodiversity value and ecological connectivity across Trent Park through a woodland management plan.
The loss of any habitats needs to be weighed in the balance against the creation, restoration and enhancement of existing areas. It is likely that existing ponds and woodland through appropriate management will be able to secure long term benefits for the site, ultimately improving ecological quality. The applicants believe that they have now demonstrated that the unavoidable loss of areas of priority habitats will be more than adequately mitigated for within the development through the creation, restoration and enhancement of existing and new priority habitats. Officers consider that whilst the matter is inevitably balanced, they endorse this conclusion.

3.  Bats

Surveys have been carried out to evaluate the effect of the proposed development on bats and there is a condition requiring bat licence to be obtained before development can commence.

A condition requiring the submission of a licence for development works affecting bats to be obtained before development commences is proposed to be attached to any forthcoming planning permission which would need to detail the proposed protection, mitigation and/or enhancement required, both during construction works and once the development is complete. It is considered that this, in the light of the work that has already been undertaken on the issue, provides sufficient certainty that any adverse effects on important ecological features would be avoided.

Impact on Character of Surrounding Area

8.80 Within the master plan for the site the applicants have created a series of broad Character Areas that they believe will enhance the overall sense of place within the wider Trent Park proposals. The intention is that each of the Areas would have their own distinctive visual qualities whilst responding to the important historic assets and landscape settings discussed elsewhere in this report.

8.81 For the information of Members, the Character Areas are:

1.  West Wing and Mansion
2.  The Woodland Glade
3.  Daffodil Lawn
4.  Gubbay Park
5.  Stable Block
6.  Walled Garden
7.  Wisteria Drive
8.  Dew Pond
9.  Oak Walk
10.  Ice House Wood

8.82 The applicants have endeavoured to strengthen what they describe as an Estate Village character across Trent Park by sharing a palette of details that they feel are appropriate to the individual building hierarchy. On the edge of the development, where they are closest to the wider Country Park or open fields, the houses have been designed to be lower in their density and more informally located in relation to each other. Where they are located within more formal landscape settings, such as the Gubbay Park area or near to the Dew Pond, the buildings are more formally sited as groups or street compositions. The architectural approach adopted across most of the site is traditional. The two notable exceptions to this are the Walled Garden and the Woodland Glade. In the case of the Walled Garden the significant constraints of the site, including the listed status of the wall itself, have leant themselves to a more contemporary approach of buildings. This is something that is considered to work extremely well and, although different to the general approach across the site, would comply with the Character Area approach described above.

8.83 The design of the Woodland Glade is the Character Area that has developed most over time. The proposals remain to deliver four detached 3-bed houses, but their design, appearance and
orientation have been developed so as to propose a contemporary development that sits more comfortably within its surroundings than previous iterations. The updating of the layout improves the connectivity with the site boundaries, with the creation of two publicly accessible landscape areas also connecting the Arboretum and Lawns with the existing woodland to the west. One of the longstanding concerns has been a desire to ensure that the buildings would not have an unacceptably detrimental visual impact on people using the public footpaths near to this part of the development. There has been discussion over time about the appropriateness of developing anything within this part of the site and Historic England has expressed reservations about this specific element of the development as explained elsewhere. There is an existing derelict detached building on the site and, as a matter of fact, there would be an increase in the quantum of development here with the site boundary extending further north than the existing curtilage. However, Officers feel that the specifics of the proposal, the number of landscape enhancements, the relationship with the wider park and the fact that the architectural quality of the proposed buildings has improved significantly since the scheme was first submitted means that the Woodland Glade proposals can be supported in their current form.

8.84 It is apparent that with the exception of these two character areas the proposed new buildings generally draw from more traditional precedents and the Mansion and the other historic buildings on the site do provide opportunities to reflect this approach, as well as to ensure that the listed structures and the buildings making a positive contribution to the Park retain their pre-eminence, in terms of their setting within the wider site.

8.85 The scale, height and mass of the proposed buildings does vary across the site and the applicants have endeavoured to take advantage of the change in levels across the site as well as the change in the landscaping within Trent Park and the critical views, both near and far. The heights of the various elements do range from two to three storeys for houses and two to four storeys for the apartment blocks, the highest of which are located on Southern Lane and on the opposite side of the Daffodil Lawn from the Mansion. Overall scale at the south-western corner of the site reflects the fact that the vacant sports hall building exists at present. As mentioned elsewhere, the Visual Impact Assessment has confirmed that these taller blocks would not have an unacceptable visual impact on long views, despite their height and location.

8.86 As identified in the comments on the scheme by the Conservation and Urban Design Officer, there are several design points relating to certain individual house types that need to be addressed. Conditions are recommended to deal with these points

Density

8.87 As set out under the NPPF (para. 49) ‘housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Plans should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. The proposals at Trent Park should be considered in this overarching national policy context. The London Plan sets a minimum ten year housing target for Enfield (2015-2025) of 7,976 dwellings (798 per annum). The delivery of 262 dwellings here will make an important contribution to the Borough’s housing targets, in particular, and London’s overall housing need, in general.

8.88 London Plan policy 3.4 does require developments to optimise housing output for different types of locations in accordance with the adopted density matrix. Trent Park is considered to be in a suburban location which, given the very low PTAL rating here, would support a development of 35-75 units per hectare. The site is obviously an unusual one and including all of the restored landscape would achieve a density of 12 units per hectare. Assessing what might be considered to be the development area only, and therefore excluding the publicly accessible open space, the scheme would achieve a density of 32 units per hectare. Looking at the development itself, even this density will vary across the site, with different parts of it being denser, in relative terms, than others.
8.89 This is clearly below the London Plan density guidance. However, as Members will be aware, this is guidance only and the particular characteristics of the site, as well as its policy designation as a MDS, mean that in this instance it is necessary to look beyond a purely numerical density assessment. There is inevitably a need to balance the option of maximising the site’s potential to deliver housing against the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, as well as the likely consequences of a denser scheme. Taking all of this into account, it is considered that the sites housing delivery potential has been optimised.

8.90 A numerical assessment of density is but one factor to consider in assessing whether the site can accommodate the quantum of development. The NPPF (section 7) confirms that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, with good design being a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 59 of the NPPF confirms that design policies should “avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally”. Paragraph 60 advises that “decision should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes…[nor] stifle innovation, innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles…[although it is] proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness” while paragraph 61 advises that “…decisions should address…the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment”. Paragraph 64 confirms that when development fails to take opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions through poor design, permission should be refused. This is reiterated at DMD37 (“Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development”) where it is advised that development which is not suitable for its intended function, that is inappropriate to its context, or which fails to have appropriate regard to its surroundings, will be refused.

8.91 London Plan policy 7.1 (“Lifetime neighbourhoods”) advises that the design of new buildings and the spaces created by them should “help to reinforce or enhance the character, permeability, and accessibility of the neighbourhood” while policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 confirm the requirement for achieving the highest architectural quality, taking into consideration the local context and its contribution to that context. Design should respond to contributing towards “a positive relationship between urban structure and natural landscape features…”. Policy DMD37 (“Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development”) confirms the criteria upon which applications will be assessed.

8.92 In the case of the Trent Park Masterplan proposals Officers have given due consideration to the design and quality of the accommodation to be provided, the siting and scale of the development, its relationship to site boundaries, areas outside the site and adjoining properties, as well as the quantity, and quality, of amenity space to support the development. In all these respects, the development is considered to be acceptable.

9. Highway Considerations

9.1 It is evident from the responses received throughout the pre-application and formal application process that the highway implications of the current proposal are one of the key areas of concern in relation to the planning application. As explained above, the Trent Park Conservation Committee has approached the Assembly Member for Enfield & Barnet directly to set out their concerns about the development. As a result, Officers have spent a significant amount of time seeking to understand how the development would impact on traffic movements and specifically the vehicular access at the southern end of Snakes Lane.

9.2 In terms of the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) the main site, including the proposed residential areas, is not surprisingly 0, whilst the main access near to Oakwood Underground station is in a PTAL 4 area. There is no controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the locality. As described above, the site includes areas of park and a listed building which the public currently visit. The Southgate hockey club is also on the site which shares the Snakes Lane access point, but is not included in the main application.
9.3 As explained elsewhere, although the site is currently unused, the former educational institution campus used to serve 3,300 full time equivalent students and 360 full/part time staff with a total of 236 student residential units and 426 car parking spaces on site. Planning permission would not be required to continue this educational use.

Public Transport Accessibility

9.4 The main part of the site has a PTAL Level of 0 which is the lowest possible score and indicates very poor access to the public transport network. However, it must be noted that at the end of Snakes Lane, the proposed primary access point, the PTAL level is 4 (Good) due to the availability of bus services and the close proximity of a London Underground station (Oakwood on the Piccadilly Line which now benefits from the Night Tube).

9.5 The applicant has illustrated, through the use of the TfL Time Mapping tool (TIM), that the site is accessible to key areas in London within a 45 to 60 minute travel time. They have also noted that within walking distance of the Bramley Road access are bus stops providing links to Enfield Town, Barnet, Turnpike Lane and Hatfield.

9.6 It is acknowledged that the western access to the site can also be used to get to Cockfosters station. However, the site is outside the accepted 1km catchment for this station so it has not been considered relevant for this assessment.

Cycling and Pedestrian Access

9.7 The proposed cycling and pedestrian access strategies for the wider site appear to provide suitable routes for the public and residents. The PERS audit is noted and it is acknowledged that the most significant on-site issues have been addressed in the proposals. This includes footway improvements along the length of Snakes Lane which will remain the primary cyclist and pedestrian access from Bramley Road.

9.8 Along Snakes Lane it would, of course, be preferable to have a separate cycling lane, but the width of Snakes Lane (5.5 metre average carriageway width) makes this impractical. The Lane must also accommodate a suitably sized footway and provide safe access for larger vehicles and the relatively low number of predicted vehicle trips, coupled with proposed lighting improvements, should reduce the likelihood of collisions. Therefore, the proposed approach is acceptable.

9.9 As part of the highway works at the Snakes Lane / Bramley Road junction, the existing crossing provision to the west of Snakes Lane will be reviewed. It is recognised that this is an important route given that it leads from the main cycling and pedestrian access for residents, including the courtesy bus turning facility, to bus stops and the London Underground station at Oakwood.

9.10 It is noted that there is an existing cycling route along Bramley Road (A110) which serves the site via the Snakes Lane access. Any works at the Snakes Lane / Bramley Road junction should make suitable provision for the existing cycling route and, where possible, improve access to the application site.

9.11 In addition, the proposed highway works will make suitable provision for the existing cycling routes and the issues identified in the PERS audit where possible. Agreed interventions include the provision of a raised table on Snakes Lane and the clearing of vegetation. Financial contributions will be secured for improvements to the dropped kerbs and tactile paving around the main access from Bramley Road.

Vehicular Access

9.12 The main access for vehicles will be along Snakes Lane from Bramley Road. This is a carriageway with 5.5 metres average width and a footway with a minimum width of 1.8 metres. While this is acceptable for general traffic, this is a relatively narrow carriageway so larger vehicle movements should, as far as possible, be kept to a minimum. At the construction phase this will
be addressed via the Construction and Logistics Plan, a draft of which has already been provided, while during occupation the Delivery and Servicing Plan will set out how this can be managed.

9.13 Throughout the pre-application process consideration has been given to the issue of congestion and delays arising from the current configuration of the junction between Bramley Road, Snakes Lane and St George’s Road and the potential impact the trips arising from the new development could have. Following an iterative process, which considered factors such as land ownership at the junction and the current and forecast use of the junction, a solution has been identified which will involve some widening of the carriageway and realignment of the northern footway / cycleway to allow an increase in the width of the turning pockets at the junction to 2.4 metres. This solution is considered acceptable given it will improve the free flow of traffic on the public highway.

9.14 However, it has been acknowledged that the proposed solution does not address all the underlying issues arising from the design and operation of the Bramley Road, Snakes Lane and Prince George Avenue junction. These could be compounded by other issues, including the possibility of higher than forecast vehicle trips from the new development. Therefore, whilst they do not currently appear to be required given the proposed junction improvement works and the forecast vehicle trips, these options could be implemented if Travel Plan monitoring, surveys of traffic volumes and accident statistics show a significant negative impact arising from the development. This will be controlled via obligations in the s106 Agreement.

9.15 The proposed barrier at the northern end of Snakes Lane should reduce car trips by visitors to the non-residential uses which in turn will minimise their impact on the junction with Bramley Road. It is noted that vehicles will be able to turn using land in the applicant’s ownership and that appropriate signage will be provided at the Snakes Lane / Bramley Road junction to inform the public that there is no car parking for, or access to, the site. The details of the operation of the barrier, including access arrangements for emergency / servicing vehicles, protocol in the event of failure (this should include confirmation that the barrier will revert to always open) and turning facilities, should be secured by way of a planning condition.

Public Access to the Park and Listed Mansion

9.16 It is noted that pedestrians and cyclists will be able to use the main access route along Snakes Lane and this approach, in light of proposed improvements, is acceptable. The provision of limited car parking for disabled visitors is also acceptable as is the proposal for a pre-booking system to manage this provision.

9.17 It is further noted that the public will be able to use the proposed courtesy bus and that the museum will provide information to visitors about parking, public transport availability and using the courtesy bus.

9.18 The updated proposals for community / leisure uses, in the form of a museum and café, will have an impact on the number of visitors to the site. Throughout the pre-application process the assumption has been that this use will not have on-site car parking provision, other than a limited number of disabled parking spaces and a short-stay / drop off facility for coaches. This approach will limit the impact on the Snakes Lane access and should also encourage the use of sustainable modes (as noted there is visitor parking available to the west of the site).

Courtesy Bus

9.19 While the main site has limited direct access to the public transport network, the main access point has good access so the proposed courtesy bus, which will be free to use for both residents and visitors, should improve overall access to public transport.

9.20 The proposed arrangements for the courtesy bus, including turning and stopping arrangements, frequency and hours of operation are acceptable and, along with it being required in perpetuity
with free access for both residents and visitors, should be confirmed in a s106 obligation. This obligation could include:

- at what stage is the courtesy bus operating and available for use.
- The courtesy bus being free to use and will be available equally to residents and visitors of the museum.
- Hours of operation will be from 07:00 to 22:00 weekdays and 08:00 to 18:00 at weekends.
- From 07:00 to 21:00 the frequency should be at least 4 buses per hour on a 15 minute headway subject to demand.
- From 07:00 to 09:00 and 16:00 to 18:00 the minimum frequency should be at least 6 buses per hour on a 10 minute headway.
- At all other time there should be at least 2 buses per hour running at maximum 30 minute intervals.
- The operation of the courtesy bus being reviewed with the local authority annually following the occupation of the final phase of residential development.

Onsite Highway Network Design

9.21 The highway network design set out is acceptable and includes:

- Main roads of a suitable width to allow the regular circulation of vehicles including for servicing needs such as refuse collection.
- Smaller scale secondary and tertiary roads which provide an attractive and safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Appropriate space for parking and turning vehicles.
- Non-linear road layout with speed tables / shared surfaces to reduce traffic speeds.

9.22 Officers have made it clear that the Council will not seek to adopt the roads and paths as public highway which has been agreed by the applicant. The details of the highway network, including parking and servicing provision, will be subject to a pre-commencement planning condition. This allows flexibility in designing the final layouts to consider points raised during the application process.

Delivery and Servicing

9.23 It is not anticipated that delivery vehicles will make a significant contribution to traffic generation and swept path analysis indicates that 11 metres refuse and 10 metre rigid vehicles should be able to service the development safely and conveniently. An Outline Delivery and Servicing Plan has been provided with the Transport Assessment. The proposals contained therein are acceptable and will form the basis for a final plan, which it is proposed should be secured by way of a pre-occupation planning condition.

Refuse and Recycling

9.24 The indicative locations and capacities for refuse and recycling are in line with Enfield’s Waste and Recycling Planning Storage Guidance ENV 08/162. Final details can be secured by way of a pre-commencement planning condition.

Car Parking

9.25 Using the assumed mix of residential units, indicative requirements for car parking spaces can be calculated. Members will be aware that the London Plan sets out maximum car parking standards for new residential development:
The London Plan sets out maximum car parking standards for new residential development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of beds:</th>
<th>2 or less</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces:</td>
<td>Less than 1 per unit</td>
<td>Up to 1.5 per unit</td>
<td>Up to 2 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this indicative parking provision for residents would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Provision</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Indicative maximum Parking Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 bed</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also a requirement for additional visitor parking spaces to be provided at between 10% and 20% of resident parking provision. This equates to between 39 and 77 spaces using the London Plan standards. Given that the site does not have access to any other parking provision the expectation would be that visitor parking is at the higher end of the range.

The TA indicates that there will be a total of 490 car parking spaces provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Visitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operatio n</th>
<th>Less than 1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This level of parking provision is in excess of the London Plan maximum standards. However, in order to be compliant with national policy, the London Plan does note that in outer London areas with low PTAL (generally PTALs 0-1) Boroughs should consider higher levels of provision.

With this in mind, given the unique nature of this site, including the very low direct access to public transport, it is appropriate to allow for slightly higher provision. Therefore, acceptable maximum residential parking provision would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Provision</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Indicative maximum Parking Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the proposed residential parking provision is only in excess of this by one space it is considered to be acceptable and compliant with the London Plan. Similarly, overall visitor parking (with disabled provision included) on the main body of the site is 64 spaces which is towards the higher end of the required range, but is acceptable given the unique features of this site.
9.34 According to the London Plan electric vehicle parking should be provided on a basis of:

- 20% of all spaces active.
- 20% of all spaces passive.

9.35 The TA indicates that 137 (28%) of spaces will be active and a further 20% (98) will be passive. This is more than the London Plan requirements which is welcome.

9.36 The overall car parking arrangements should be supported by a Car Parking Management Plan which can be secured by way of a pre-occupation condition and should include:

- The details of the proposed parking provision including phasing, dimensions and where necessary tracking to demonstrate safe and convenient access to and from spaces;
- The allocation process for the various types of spaces including residential, disabled, electric vehicles and visitor;
- The enforcement regime including the frequency and proposed penalties; and
- The process for determining if spaces are being utilised and how they might be re-allocated.

**Cycle Parking**

9.37 The London Plan sets out minimum standards for residential development:

i) Long Stay - 1 space per studio and 1 bed, 2 spaces per all other dwellings.
ii) Short Stay - 1 space per 40 units.

9.38 For D1 - Other and D2 uses the minimum standards are:

iii) Long Stay - 1 space per 8 staff
iv) Short Stay - 1 space per 100sqm

9.39 For this development, minimum provision would therefore be:

i) Residential C3 (35 Studio and 1 bed, 237 other dwellings) 474 long stay, 35 short Stay).
ii) Community D1 (1,183sqm - 8 staff assumed) 1 long stay, 11 short stay.
iii) Leisure D2 (451sqm - 8 staff assumed) 1 long stay, 4 short stay.

Totals: 476 long stay and 50 short stay.

9.40 The applicant has confirmed that provision will be in line with these requirements. In addition 20 spaces will be provided at the Snakes Lane turning facility. The details of the numbers, locations and designs of the cycle parking provision will be secured by way of a planning condition.

**Car Club**

9.41 The proposal for 2 car club parking bays to be provided, and the confirmation in the TA that discussions with a suitable provider have taken place, are noted. Whilst this is a positive step the impact of a car club on car ownership is likely to be less significant than for a higher density, town centre development. However, it could potentially work to constrain ownership of 2nd and 3rd cars. It is noted that existing residents who live within the park have expressed an interest in the Car Club.

**Travel Plans**

9.42 The Framework Travel Plan submitted with the application is acceptable as are the proposed targets for increasing the mode shares of sustainable transport modes. Alongside this separate travel plans will be secured for each phase of the development. This will allow each travel plan to
reflect the particular challenges and opportunities arising from the various residential areas and uses.

9.43 It has been agreed that the details of these arrangements, including particular targets and the number and timings of surveys, will be dealt with via a s106 obligation.

Trip Generation

9.44 The assumed trip generation outlined in the Transport Assessment is based on TRICS analysis of trips generated by other comparable development sites which is allocated to modes using census data.

Baseline

9.45 The use of trip generation information from surveys undertaken when the site was being used as an education facility provides a clear baseline for comparison. It is acceptable that the survey data used is for peak periods as this corresponds to the modelling undertaken for the proposed development which considers a peak traffic scenario. Although the site is vacant, the education use remains the lawful use and could be re-commenced without the need for a planning permission for the use.

TRICS Analysis

9.46 It is noted that the unique nature of this site means that it is difficult to find suitable comparators in the TRICS database. The two sites which have been identified are broadly comparable (they have similar access to public transport, dwellings or parking provision) and are suitable for the purposes of assessing likely trip generation.

Trip Rates

9.47 Based on the methodology employed the forecast two-way vehicle trips (total of entries and exits) compared to the baseline can be summarised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>Daily Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.48 The Council’s Highway Engineer has stated that this means that overall there will be a significant reduction in total daily trips and trips in the PM peak while the AM peak will see a broadly comparable number of trips. This indicates that overall there should be a reduction in total vehicle trips compared to the previous use. This means that the forecast vehicle trips arising from the proposed development will not have a significant impact and are not higher than for the previously consented use.

9.49 It is noted that the phasing of the development will mean that there is a gradual increase in vehicle trips with opportunities to monitor and assess the changes. It is also noted that, should the Travel Plan targets be achieved, there will be a reduction in vehicle trips as compared to the forecast trips as set out above.

9.50 It is also noted that, in terms of the strategic road network, Department for Transport counts on Bramley Road indicate that daily traffic flows have been dropping.

Bramley Road, Snakes Lane and Prince George Avenue Junction Capacity

9.51 One of the main potential transport issues with the scheme is the junction between Bramley Road, Snakes Lane and Prince George Avenue which provides the primary access point. The applicant has undertaken video analysis at this junction which indicated that:
• The main issue is cars turning right into Prince George Avenue obstructing Bramley Road.
• The introduction of a yellow box on the southbound carriageway has had a positive impact on the general functioning of the junction.
• There is some queuing along Snakes Lane.

9.52 Using this data as a baseline, the applicant undertook junction modelling (using the industry recognised PICADY) which forecast that, with the introduction of the vehicle trips arising from the proposed development, at most times of day there would be only be a small number of additional cars queuing at the junction.

9.53 The exception is in the AM peak where the model forecast that there will be queuing along Snakes Lane with a maximum length of 53 vehicles. It is noted that whilst this indicates a potential issue, it is likely that the actual numbers will be significantly lower because:

• The model looks at vehicle movements in free flowing traffic. This means that it does not allow for drivers ‘nosing’ out into slow moving traffic or using the yellow box markings; and
• There will be a range of measures to encourage residents to use public transport, walk and cycle.

9.54 In addition, there will be significant mitigation measures put in place (see below) which should minimise the number of vehicle trips arising from the development and their resultant impact on the junction.

9.55 Therefore, while there is some concern about possible additional queuing at the junction (particularly along Snakes Lane in the AM peak), the Council’s Transportation Engineer considers that the actual impacts arising from the development are likely to be minimal across the day and overall will not be of significant detriment to the public highway network. However, it is acknowledged that to an extent this is dependent on the success of the proposed mitigation measures so should be monitored accordingly, most likely via regular junction surveys. These should be secured by way of a planning obligation and linked to Travel Plan monitoring. As outlined in the Vehicular Access section, evidence of a significant negative impact could trigger the implementation of additional highway works.

Hockey Club

9.56 The full hockey club site has not been included as part of this application (part of the car park has been included to facilitate improvement works) and it is acknowledged that the hockey club is an existing use which has been factored into the baseline for the wider application site.

9.57 However, the on-going growth of the club and special events present particular challenges with regard to the number of trips generated, albeit generally off peak. In addition the loss of overspill parking, which until recently has been provided on the application site, will increase the pressure on the existing hockey club onsite provision. Therefore, it is welcome that mitigation is being considered:

• Travel Plan to encourage use of sustainable modes including via the shuttle bus being provided as part of the main application.
• Reconfiguration of the existing car parking provision and improved management to maximise capacity.
• Additional car parking provision on the hockey club site for occasional use. This is the subject of a separate planning permission 16/05472/FUL which has been approved by the Council.

9.58 It is suggested that a s106 obligation is put in place which requires suitable mitigation to be agreed with the Council for the hockey club site prior to the occupation of the residential elements of the application proposal.
Given the scale of the development and the impact it could have on the highway network and the amenity of local residents a Construction Logistics Plan will be required. An Outline Construction and Logistics Plan has been provided which is broadly acceptable, although the Council’s Transportation Officer states that the final version will need to clearly outline a number of points:

- Given the phasing of development, how construction traffic will be managed to minimise the impact including on existing and new residents.
- Measures to reduce Work Related Road Risk.

A final version will be agreed prior to development commencing and will be secured by way of a planning condition.

Mitigation Measures

Whilst the forecast trip generation indicates that the proposed development should not generate any more vehicle trips than the extant educational use, the need to provide a sustainable development has been recognised by the applicants, as has the potential impact of high car trips rates. Therefore, a range of mitigation measures are proposed which, during both construction and occupation, should encourage the use of sustainable modes and limit non-resident trips by car:

- Access controls.
- Car club provision.
- Car parking management plan.
- Courtesy bus.
- Construction logistics plan.
- Cycling and walking improvements.
- Sustainable transport package.
- Travel plans.

There are also proposals to improve the junction at the main vehicular access point, which should have a positive impact on existing queuing on the public highway and provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast trips arising from the development.

Impact on Amenities of adjoining occupiers

There are a small number of private residential dwellings situated within Trent Park, but all outside the application site. North and South View Cottages are a pair of properties sited on the southern side of the Southern Access Road opposite the development site, Rookery Cottages are to the north and east of the Southgate Hockey Club clubhouse building, Dairy House is currently vacant and is to the rear of the existing Sports Hall, whilst Shaws Wood Cottages are at the very eastern end of the Southern Access Road.

The most affected properties will be North and South View Cottages, given that they currently have no building opposite them and the proposal involves the Character Area known as Gubbay Park being erected on the northern side of the road. The development in this part of the site would comprise 3 storey houses to the east and 3 and 4 storey high blocks of flats to the west meaning that it is inevitable that things will change as a result of the proposal, certainly in terms of outlook. Acknowledging this point, the scheme has been amended so that each apartment block has been moved west increasing the gap by 4 metres, to respond to the relationship across the road. This has allowed the internal north-south link within the site to be located immediately opposite the existing residential properties, thus maximising the space on the north of the road, a hedge to the east of the apartment boundary to be relocated and additional semi-mature trees planted to screen the proposed apartment block from adjacent existing properties to the south.

As explained above, Officers are clear that the proposed development would have an impact on existing residents, given the fact that the site now is minimally used. However, it is considered
that the impact would, on balance, be acceptable and there are no daylight/sunlight impacts as a result of the proposed development.

9.64 In terms of all other properties within Trent Park, putting aside the matter of the levels of activity that the development would create over and above what is currently experienced by residents, the hard impact in terms of loss of outlook, light and privacy is not significant enough to justify an objection on these grounds.

9.65 Trent Park Golf Club on Enfield Road has made two representations. Although they say that they support the redevelopment of the Middlesex University site they say that the inclusion of the redeveloped Oakwood Lodge at the Southern end of Snakes Lane presents a significant threat to the on-going business operations at the Golf Club. This is the site of a former single storey lodge which the applicant proposes to demolish and create a new turning circle for the courtesy bus along with the erection of a two storey dwelling (similar in footprint extent to the existing lodge) with an adjoining garage for storage of the courtesy buses with driver facilities above. The Golf Club are concerned that it will bring it in closer proximity to an established noise source and, therefore, provide the potential for future complaints of noise nuisance leading to pressure to curtail the licensed activities at the clubhouse, which underpin the overall viability of the golf club. The proposed dwelling is marginally closer to the boundary than the existing, but this is not considered to have any significant impact on its receptiveness to noise from the Golf Club.

9.66 Notwithstanding the fact that this part of the site has an existing residential unit sited on it and the proposal is to replace this with a single new dwelling built to modern standards, the proposal would re-introduce residential receptors into proximity to a source of noise and disturbance which could potentially lead to complaint. However the Golf Club already operates in a residential area and it is considered that subject to construction and window detailing in the buildings then it would be unreasonable to withhold planning consent in this instance taking into account the circumstances of the site and the background to it.

Sustainable Design and Construction

9.67 During the lifetime of the planning application there have been a number of discussions with LBE Officers, as well as Historic England, concerning a SUD’s strategy for the site. This has resulted in the submission of a revised SUDs design in response to concerns about the proposed catchment areas and the character of the proposed SUD system. The purpose of the strategy is to demonstrate how the surface water for the site can be accommodated on it, whilst at the same time creating acceptable landscape features that acknowledge the sensitivity, and importance, of the site. The design of the SUDs has needed to take account of the site’s topography, the location of trees (both existing and proposed) as well as the key historic landscape features within Trent Park.

9.68 The applicant has amended the SUDs system over time in order to increase the upstream attenuation which has resulted in a reduction in the size of the attenuation ponds proposed for the north-east and north-west corners of the lawn to the north of the Mansion. Whilst these landscape features are new the view taken by Officers is that they are considered to be, on balance, acceptable having taken into account their purpose and the fact that alternatives are not immediately obvious.

9.69 The changes to the strategy included:

- Reduction of the North-eastern SUDs pond and its relocation to the east outside of the lawn area.
- Updates to the swale alignment to the west of the Mansion as a result of The Glade’s updated housing layout.
- Gravel infiltration trench in the daffodil lawn area, previously shown as a grassed swale.
- Detailed design to reduce the size of the north-western pond.
9.70 As a result of the additional information and amendments set out above, it is considered this has been satisfactorily addressed, subject to conditions with respect to the SuDS details and source control SuDS measures.

10. Environmental Assessment

10.1 The purpose of the ES is to consider and assess wither the Proposed Development is likely to have any significant effects on the environment and, if so, whether there are any mitigation measures which can be undertaken to adequately address any significant effects.

10.2 As part of the EIA process, a Scoping Report was submitted to the Council on 16th May 2016. Scoping forms one of the first stages of the EIA process and it is through scoping that the Council and other parties were consulted on the scope and methodology of the EIA. The Council issued their EIA Scoping Opinion on 9th August 2016. This Scoping Opinion and associated responses from other consultees have been taken into account throughout the EIA process.

10.3 Through the EIA Scoping process, the following topics were scoped into the EIA:

- Socio-economics;
- Transportation and Access;
- Noise and Vibration;
- Air Quality;
- Ground Conditions;
- Water Resources, Drainage and Flood Risk;
- Archaeology;
- Ecology;
- Landscape and Visual; and
- Heritage (incl. Historic Landscape and Built Heritage).

10.4 The following topics were scoped out of the EIA as they were not considered to cause likely significant environmental effects:

- Wind Microclimate;
- Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing;
- Electronic Interference;
- Waste and Recycling; and
- Historic Landscape

10.5 The EIA process has identified sensitive receptors for the purpose of assessing the likely environmental effects during demolition, construction, refurbishment and operational phases of the Proposed Development. The identified key sensitive receptors include:

- Neighbouring / local residential properties;
- Neighbouring and local commercial properties and businesses;
- Public Amenity Space;
- Demolition, construction and refurbishment
- Application Site workers;
- Future on-site users;
- Ecology;
- Air quality;
- Surface water;
- Ground water;
- Subsurface and surface utilities;
- Building structure;
- Pedestrian and cycle network;
- Local highway network;
- Public transport network;
10.6 Under the EIA Regulations, an ES is required to provide “an outline of the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the proposals, taking into account the environmental effects”. The alternatives analysis is a key part of the EIA process and serves to ensure that environmental considerations are built.

10.7 The EIA has considered the ‘no development’ alternative, the use of ‘alternative sites’ and ‘alternative designs’ in response to consultee comments. The ‘No Development’ alternative refers to the option of leaving the Application Site in its current state and would be undesirable for a number of reasons, including:

- The Application Site has been unoccupied for several years leaving it in a state of decay;
- There is the potential to bring a useful asset back into beneficial use for the Application Site to be redeveloped for residential, recreational and community purposes; and
- There is a need for refurbishment and renovation of on-site listed buildings and structures.

10.8 As a result of the above, the ‘No Development’ option was ruled out by the Applicant into the project design at the earliest possible stage and this is accepted.

10.9 Chapter 15 of the ES: “Residual Effects and Conclusions” presents the residual effects and conclusions of the ES. Residual effects are defined as those effects that remain following the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures relate to each of the key phases (design; demolition, construction and refurbishment; or operation) of the Proposed Development and are discussed in full in the relevant technical chapters of ES Volume I. Each technical chapter also contains a detailed summary of both positive (beneficial) and negative (adverse) residual effects arising from the Proposed Development.

10.10 During demolition, construction and refurbishment, there will be a number of temporary moderate, minor to negligible adverse effects, due primarily in relation to the effect of demolition, construction and refurbishment works on users / vehicles / pedestrians of local roads and the existing cycle network, as well as the effect of emissions of dust and traffic noise on nearby sensitive receptors. In addition to this, there will also be minor to negligible adverse effects as a result of demolition, construction and refurbishment activities on buried heritage remains, works resulting in disturbance to non-statutory sites, and the effects of traffic and construction activities on views and the tranquillity and sense of place.

10.11 These effects will be temporary in nature (i.e. reversible) (with the exception of any disturbance to archaeology which would be permanent), and in the case of the machinery, this is considered to be a worst-case (i.e. machinery working all the time), which wouldn’t realistically be the case. Further to this, the associated works are considered to be normal for such a large-scale of development. As mitigation and required by condition, the Applicant will develop and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), setting out how the Council’s requirements will be met. The CEMP will be prepared prior to the Commencement of any on-site works, in consultation with the LBE, and will identify mitigation measures that will be implemented to reduce the potential for significant adverse effects.

10.12 Subject to the implementation of the CEMP, the demolition, construction and refurbishment of the Proposed Development is not considered likely to have any significant, long-term damaging effects on the natural or socio-economic environment.

10.13 In addition to the CEMP, a staged programme of archaeological investigation is proposed, including archaeological monitoring and evaluation, followed by detailed archaeological mitigation once the archaeological potential has been clarified, thereby managing any significant adverse effects.
10.14 Once completed and occupied, the ES identifies that the proposed development will result in moderate adverse effects in relation to effects on road users / vehicles at Snakes Lane, negligible to minor effect of noise from road traffic and a moderate adverse effect on to 2 of 38 local views (noting that the other 36 views result in neutral to minor, moderate and major beneficial effects). However, further to this, beneficial socio-economic effects are identified in relation to: employment, additional local spending by residents, affordable housing provision, play space provision, sport and leisure provision, crime and safety, and provision of housing and open space. Other beneficial effects (some of which are also significant) relate to the effect on users / vehicles of local roads; pedestrians; the Trent Park Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation; bluebell habitat loss and fragmentation; great crested newt habitat loss and fragmentation and creation of barriers; and view of the development.

10.15 Whilst it is acknowledged that some adverse effects will be experienced during the (temporary) demolition, construction and refurbishment phase, and once the proposed Development is completed and operational, the benefits of bringing the proposed development forward are considered too far outweigh these adverse effects. The development will have an overriding beneficial effect and will regenerate and enhance the application site, contribute to the setting of the wider area, and will secure the comprehensive redevelopment and on-going management of the site.

10.16 The design of the proposed development has evolved through continuous consultation with officers and consultation with other key consultees, including the GLA and TfL. Considerable care has been given to ensuring an appropriate design outcome through extensive EIA testing and consultation.

10.17 Overall, the Proposed Development would have a positive effect on the regeneration of the Application Site, on-going management, and contribution to meeting a need for new housing and community space. The delivery of much needed new homes, community space and the provision of high quality public realm and open space will provide important benefits to the area.

11. Community Infrastructure Levy

11.1 The Mayoral CIL is collected by the Council on behalf of the Mayor of London. The amount that is sought is for the scheme is calculated on the net increase of gross internal floor area multiplied by an Outer London weighting (£20/sqm) and a monthly indexation figure.

11.2 The development is CIL liable for the construction of the additional residential floor space, less the existing floor space to be demolished and the 58 affordable units which are eligible for relief.

11.3 The Council introduced its own CIL on 1 April 2016. The money collected from the levy (Regulation 123 Infrastructure List) will fund rail and causeway infrastructure for Meridian Water. For residential CIL, the site falls within the higher charging rate zone (£120/sqm).

12. Legal Agreement

12.1 Section 106 contributions can still be sought for items of infrastructure not identified on the Regulation 123 list. A legal agreement will required to secure the obligations as set out below. A 5% management fee will also be incurred as per the S106 SPD.

12.2 Having regard to the content above, it is recommended that should planning permission be granted, the following obligations / contributions should be secured through a legal agreement:

12.3 The Heads of Terms for the S106 Agreement are as follows:

i) Affordable Housing
ii) Financial Contributions
   o Education
   o Health
iii) Transport / cycling
   o Libraries and other community facilities

iv) Employment and Training
   o Local labour initiatives
   o Employment skills training
   o Apprenticeships
   o Employment and skills strategy

v) Travel Plan
   o Construction travel plan
   o Residential travel plan
   o Shuttle bus review
   o Snake Lane / Bramley Road junction review

vi) Car Club and EVCP

vii) Trent Park Museum

ix) Swimming Pool and Tennis Courts
   o Public access to these facilities

x) Wildlife Centre

xi) Hockey Club Parking
   o Link to temporary and permanent overspill car parking over phased development

xii) Landscape Restoration and future management
   o Landscape management plan
   o At Risk Register

xiii) Public access across the site

xiv) Monitoring fee

13. Conclusion

13.1 As a locally designated site major developed site in the green belt, development which does not
detract from the open character of the green belt would be consistent with local policy. There is
no justified need for the site to continue in use for educational purposes and the principle of a
residential led development notwithstanding the objective of the adopted Trent Park Planning
Statement is considered acceptable. Significant weight in this assessment of principle can also
be given to the delivery of new residential units including 58 (or equivalent) affordable housing
units and safeguarding the future of the Grade II listed Mansion. Refurbishing the listed terrace
and restoring the associated landscape will also remove these elements from Heritage England’s
“at risk” registers. While residential development of the scale envisaged will of course have a
presence in the landscape and setting of Trent Park, these positive elements of the proposals are
considered to be significant and on balance, it is considered the benefits associated with the
proposed development outweigh any identified harm to the green belt principle or the surrounding
area.

13.2 While the adopted Planning Statement may not have originally recognised a residential led
development as the preferred solution, it is accepted that the employment led options including
continued educational or campus led development have not come forward. This point was the
subject of discussion with the Trent Park Working Group when it was accepted that suitable
residential led scheme could still achieve key objectives for the site. From a planning perspective,
the mitigation in the s106 on employment and training will address this policy and as a result no
objections are raised to a residential led development on these grounds.

13.3 The adopted Planning Statement did however identify the need to ensure public access to the
ground floor of the Mansion was maintained. A number of options were considered to ensure
community access and that promoted under this application is the Museum use. This is
considered acceptable in meeting the Council’s objectives. Public access across the site has also
been secured through the S106 agreement.
13.4 The delivery of affordable housing is also a requirement of local and London Plan policy. After discussions involving the GLA with Berkeley’s on the schemes viability, 58 units have now been identified as affordable housing. This increase and the mix is acceptable to the GLA and in principle, this offer is also considered acceptable to the Council. However, before finalising this position, officers are in discussion with Berkeley’s / GLA on whether this affordable housing officer could be delivered in a way which better addresses the Boroughs needs.

13.5 In terms of traffic generation and highway safety, while the transport assessment indicates that the proposed development should not generate any more vehicle trips than the extant educational use, the need to provide a sustainable development has been recognised by the applicants, as has the potential impact of high car trips rates. Therefore, a range of mitigation measures have been identified during both construction and occupation phases including proposals to improve the junction at the main vehicular access point, which should have a positive impact on existing queuing on the public highway and provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast trips arising from the development.

13.6 From a heritage perspective, Heritage England have confirmed their acceptance of the principle of residential development and the benefits to the Mansion, the terrace and the historic landscape are all recognised. These benefits are considered significant and although there are reservations regarding development in The Glade, no objection is raised and on balance, it is considered the proposed scheme is acceptable from a heritage perspective.

13.7 The ES has reviewed the impact of the development on the environment and considered a number of issues. However, with the appropriate mitigation secured through condition or legal agreement, it is considered the development will not lead to any adverse environmental or ecological effects.

13.8 It is therefore considered that on balance, the proposes development can be supported

14. Recommendation

That following referral to the Mayor of London and no objections being raised, and the securing of a Legal Agreement to secure the various obligations, the Head of Development Management be authorised to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions.

1. Time limited permission
The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the decision notice.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by S.51 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Approved Plans
The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, as set out in attached schedule 1 which forms part of this notice.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Prior to Commencement of Development Conditions

3. Great crested newt mitigation and licencing
No development hereby permitted (including demolition or site clearance works) shall commence until a licence for development works affecting great crested newts has been obtained from the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (Natural England) and a copy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Thereafter mitigations measures approved in the licence shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details. Should conditions at the site change and the applicant conclude that a licence is not required the applicant is to submit a report to the council, prior to the commencement of any development hereby permitted (including demolition or site clearance works) detailing the reasons for this assessment and this report is to be approved in writing by the council.
4. Bat mitigation and licencing
No development hereby permitted (including demolition or site clearance works) shall commence until a licence for development works affecting bats has been obtained from the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (Natural England) and a copy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Thereafter mitigations measures approved in the licence shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details. Should conditions at the site change and the applicant conclude that a licence is not required the applicant is to submit a report to the council, prior to the commencement of any development hereby permitted (including demolition or site clearance works) detailing the reasons for this assessment and this report is to be approved in writing by the council.
Reason: To ensure that bats, a protected and priority species, are not adversely affected by the proposals.

5. Reptile mitigation plan
No development hereby permitted (including demolition or site clearance works) shall commence until a reptile harm avoidance and mitigation strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Thereafter mitigations measures approved shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure that reptiles are not adversely affected by the proposals.

6. Badgers
No development hereby permitted, including any vegetation clearance shall commence until a badger sett survey of the development site and immediately adjacent areas has been undertaken. This survey shall be undertaken within 28 days of the start of works on site and a brief letter report detailing the results of the surveys is to be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. If surveys show that a licence to disturb a badger sett is required a copy of a valid licence is to be submitted to the planning authority prior to the commencement of works.
Reason: To safeguard badgers, a protected species

7. Tree protection
No development (excluding demolition and site investigation) shall commence until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees including a tree protection plan (TPP) and an arboricultural method statement (AMS) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Specific issues to be dealt with in the TPP and AMS:
 i) Location and installation of services/ utilities/ drainage.
 ii) Methods of demolition within the root protection area (RPA as defined in BS 5837: 2012) of the retained trees
 iii) Details of construction within the RPA or that may impact on the retained trees
 iv) Tree protection during construction indicated on a TPP and construction and construction activities clearly identified as prohibited in this area.
 v) Boundary treatments within the RPA
 vi) Methodology and detailed assessment of root pruning
 ix) Arboricultural supervision
 x) The method of protection for the retained trees
 The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability, and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained in accordance with policies. Informative: British Standard BS 5837 2012 –Trees in Relation to Demolition, Design and Construction

8. Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan
The development shall not commence until a Demolition and Construction Management and Logistics Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The methodology shall contain:
i) Method statement for demolition;
 ii) arrangements for wheel cleaning;
iii) arrangements for the storage of materials;
iv) arrangements for the control of dust and emissions;
v) arrangements for the securing of the site during construction;
vi) arrangements for the loading, unloading and turning of delivery, construction and service vehicles.

vii) the arrangement for the parking of contractors’ vehicles clear of the highway;
viii) the siting and design of any ancillary structures including workers conveniences (e.g. portacabins);
x) lighting during construction;
x) details of construction access and associated traffic management to the site to minimise the impact on existing and new residents;
x) Swept path analysis for long and over-sized vehicles to demonstrate that they can safely enter / exit the site from Bramley Road onto Snakes Lane; and

xii) Measures to reduce Work Related Road Risk.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved construction methodology unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of the development does not lead to damage to the existing highway and to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties and the environment.

9. Construction Site Waste Management Plan

The development shall not commence until a Construction Site Waste Management Plan (CSWMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan should include as a minimum:

i) Target benchmarks for resource efficiency set in accordance with best practice

ii) Procedures and commitments to minimise non-hazardous construction waste at a design stage.

iii) Procedures for minimising hazardous waste.

iv) Monitoring, measuring and reporting of hazardous and non-hazardous site waste production according to the defined waste groups (according to the waste streams generated by the scope of the works)

v) Procedures and commitments to sort and divert waste from landfill in accordance with the waste hierarchy

Reason: To maximise the amount of waste diverted from landfill consistent with the waste hierarchy and strategic targets set by Policies 5.17, 5.18, 5.19, 5.20 of the London Plan and the draft North London Waste Plan

10. North Lake Buffer Zone Details

No development along the North Lake shall take place until a scheme for the provision and management of an 8 metre wide buffer zone alongside the north lake within the development site (on line of Leeging Beech Gutter), and a 5 metre wide buffer strip to ponds within the development site has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and any subsequent amendments shall be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The buffer zone scheme shall be free from built development including lighting, domestic gardens and formal landscaping. The buffer zone should provide a ‘wildlife corridor’ of planting comprising native species, which improves the river habitat and affords species a wider and therefore more robust and sustainable range of linked habitats. The buffer zone should be managed to develop a natural character, with native trees and shrubs, and grass areas left unmown or mown only later in the season to enhance their floristic and habitat value.

The schemes shall include:

i) plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone.

ii) details of any proposed planting scheme, including native species.

iii) details demonstrating how the waterbodies and their buffer zones will be protected during development and managed/maintained over the longer term. This shall include the named body responsible for management and the production of the detailed management plan.

details of any proposed footpaths, fencing, etc.
iv) details of any proposed lighting, with no light spill from artificial lighting into the watercourse or adjacent habitat (i.e. maintained at background levels <2 lux, to prevent disturbance to nocturnal wildlife such as bats).

Reason: Development that encroaches on watercourses and ponds has a potentially severe impact on their ecological value. Land alongside watercourses and ponds is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected. The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act which requires Local Authorities to have regard to nature conservation and article 10 of the Habitats Directive which stresses the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity.

11. Written Scheme of Investigation
No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land and historic buildings that are included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance, conservation, interpretation and research objectives, and:

i) The programme and methodology of site archaeological investigation and building recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works

ii) The programme and methodology for a community archaeology and history project

iii) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. this part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: In order to ensure that all historic environment investigation and recording is appropriately controlled.

Informative: The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England’s Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

12. Sustainable Drainage Strategy
Notwithstanding the details set out in the submitted Preliminary Drainage Strategy (February2017) and Drawing 1441/028 Rev B, prior to the commencement of any construction work (excluding demolition and site investigation works), details of the Sustainable Drainage Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and must conform with the Landscaping Strategy. The details shall include:

i) Sizes, storage volumes, cross-sections, long-sections (where appropriate) and locations and specifications of all the source control SuDS measures including rain gardens, raised planters, green roofs, swales and permeable paving

ii) Final sizes, storage volumes, invert levels, cross-sections and specifications of all site control SuDS measures i.e. eastern and western ponds including any control mechanisms that may restrict flows to the receiving reservoir.

iii) Discharge consent is required by the Council’s Watercourses Team, if the strategy requires any surface water discharge into the Trent Park reservoir

iv) A management plan for future maintenance, outlining who is responsible for the maintenance of certain aspects of the drainage system

Prior to Above Ground Development Conditions

13. Phasing Plan
Prior to commencement of development above ground (excluding demolition and site investigation works) herby approved, a phasing plan for the delivery of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development herby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.
14. CIL Phasing
Prior to the commencement of any CIL phase, a CIL phase plan setting out the scope of that CIL phase together with a CIL Additional Information Requirements Form shall be submitted to the Council.
Reason: To allow CIL liability to be calculated for each phase and for any reliefs to be determined.

15. Material Samples
Prior to commencement of each phase of development above ground (excluding demolition and site investigation works) hereby approved, a sample panel and a schedule of materials to be used in all external elevations including walls (including brick bonding and pointing samples), doors, windows, front entrances and balconies within the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Materials shall be provided for each phase of the:

i) New build houses
ii) New build apartment blocks on Southern Lane
iii) New build apartment blocks on Daffodil Lawn
iv) The Woodland Glade houses
v) The West Wing
vi) The Walled Garden houses

Each phase of the development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In order to ensure that the buildings have an acceptable external appearance which preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

16. Detailed Design and Materials
Detailed drawings to a scale of 1:20 to confirm the detailed design and materials of the:

i) Details of all windows and doors at scale 1:10, windows shall be set at least 115mm within window reveal

ii) Details of balconies and balustrades

iii) Details of the glazing level of all external windows

iv) Full drawn details (1:20 scale elevations, 1:2 scale detailing) of the railings and gates (including hinges, fixings, locks, finials); and

v) Details and locations of rain water pipes.

Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development under each phase hereby permitted. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality.

17. Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
Prior to the commencement of development above ground (excluding demolition and site investigation) under each phase, a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas (except privately owned domestic gardens), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the following elements:

i) Detailed extent and type of new planting including trees, shrubs, grass and all other soft landscaping, including to any podium levels;

ii) Details of biodiversity enhancements, including integral bird nesting and bat roosting opportunities on and around the new buildings;

iii) Details of the ponds including profiling and edge planting to provide biodiversity benefits;

iv) Details of woodland management;

v) Specifications for fencing demonstrating how hedgehogs and other wildlife will be able to continue to travel across the site;

vi) Description and evaluation of features to be managed (to include all natural and semi natural habitats within the application site);

vii) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
viii) Aims and objectives of management and appropriate management options for achieving these, and prescriptions for management actions;

ix) details of the hard landscaping and surfacing materials to be used within the development including footpaths, shared surfaces, access roads, parking areas, and all other hard surfacing;

x) lighting details, including type, specification and lux levels

xi) details of boundary treatments and means of enclosure;

xii) details of the public, private and communal amenity spaces and how access will be managed; and

xiii) details of management responsibilities and maintenance regimes/schedules with on-going monitoring and potential remedial measures (including a work schedule with an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).

The planting scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season after completion or occupation of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any planting which dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with new planting in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of biodiversity, sustainability and to ensure that a satisfactory standard of visual amenity is provided and maintained on site.

18. Details of Green roofs

Prior to commencement of development of the Orangery extension and Walled Garden, details of the proposed green roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The green roof shall be installed in accordance with the approved details. The green roof shall not be used for any recreational purpose and access shall only be for the purposes of the maintenance and repair or means of emergency escape. Details shall include full on-going management plan and maintenance strategy/schedule for the green roof to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To minimise the impact of the development on the ecological value of the area and to ensure the development provides the maximum possible provision towards the creation of habitats and valuable areas for biodiversity in accordance with Policy CP36 of the Core Strategy, the Biodiversity Action Plan and Policies 5.11 & 7.19 of the London Plan.

Prior to First Occupation

19. Drainage Verification Report

Prior to occupation of each phase of the development, a Verification Report demonstrating that the approved drainage / SuDS measures for that phase have been fully implemented shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. This report must include:

i) As built drawings of the sustainable drainage systems including level information (if appropriate)

ii) Photographs of the completed sustainable drainage systems

iii) Any relevant certificates from manufacturers/ suppliers of any drainage features

iv) A confirmation statement of the above signed by a chartered engineer

Reason: To ensure the sustainable management of water, minimise flood risk, minimise discharge of surface water outside of the curtilage of the property and ensure that the drainage system will remain functional throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with Policy CP28 of the Core Strategy and Policies 5.12 & 5.13 of the London Plan and the NPPF.

20. Details of children’s playspace

Prior to occupation of each phase of the development, details of all play spaces within that phase including drawings and specification of the proposed play equipment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details approved prior to occupation of the development and shall be maintained thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of good design, safety and protecting future residential amenity and to ensure the development is of an inclusive design.
21. Details of external lighting and CCTV
Prior to occupation of each phase of the development, details of any external lighting and CCTV proposed for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved external lighting shall be provided before any part of the relevant phase of development is occupied.
Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenities of adjoining occupiers and/or the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

22. Details of Snakes Lane control barrier and turning facilities
Prior to first occupation of the development the details of the Snakes Lane control barrier shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
   i) The location of the control barrier
   ii) The design of the control barrier
   iii) A strategy and details of turning facilities for the rejection of unauthorised vehicles.
   iv) Arrangements for emergency / servicing vehicles
   v) Protocol in the event of failure
Reason: To ensure the implementation of the development does not lead to damage to the existing highway and to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties and the environment.

23. Servicing and delivery plan
Prior to occupation of each phase of the development a Delivery and Servicing Plan for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall then be implemented as approved and remain in operation for the lifetime of the development.
Reason: In order to ensure that deliveries and servicing of the site is managed effectively so as to minimise impact upon the road network and to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of residential properties and in the interests of road safety.

24. Car parking management plan (residential and D1 uses)
Prior to occupation of each phase of the development, a Car Parking Management Plan for that phase shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Car Parking Management Plan shall include:
   i) The details of the proposed parking provision including dimensions and where necessary tracking to demonstrate safe and convenient access to and from spaces.
   ii) The allocation process for the various types of spaces including residential, disabled, electric vehicles and visitor.
   iii) The enforcement regime including the frequency and proposed penalties.
   iv) The location and management of the coach parking space.
Reason: To ensure the safe and efficient operation of the site’s car parking areas and to comply with the Borough’s parking policies and standards.

25. Details of cycle parking
Each phase of the development shall not be occupied until details of the siting, number and design of secure/covered cycle parking spaces for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be installed and permanently retained for cycle parking.
Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking spaces in line with the Council’s adopted standards.

26. Refuse and recycling strategy
Each phase of the development shall not be occupied until details of refuse storage facilities including facilities for the recycling of waste to be provided within the development, in accordance with the London Borough of Enfield – Waste and Recycling Planning Storage Guidance ENV 08/162, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied or use commences.
Reason: In the interests of amenity and the recycling of waste materials in support of the Boroughs waste reduction targets.
27. Travel Plan
Prior to the first occupation of the development a Travel Plan, setting out targets for each phase of the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan should also include information on the arrangements and operation of the courtesy shuttle bus with details of the hours and frequency of operation and stopping arrangements. The approved Travel Plan shall be implemented on a phased basis, in accordance with the phased occupation of the development, and thereafter maintained and developed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To promote the use of sustainable modes of travel to the development site in accordance with the Borough’s transport policies.

28. Details of zero / low carbon technologies
Where proposed, the renewable energy technologies (photovoltaics) shall be installed and operational prior to the first occupation of each phase of the development. Prior to installation, details of the renewable energy technologies shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interest of sustainable development and to ensure that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that CO2 emission reduction targets by renewable energy are met in accordance with Policy CP20 of the Core Strategy, Policies 5.2, 5.3, 5.7 & 5.9 of the London Plan 2011 and the NPPF.

29. Hours of use for leisure use / museum
The hours of operation of the museum (D1 Use Classes) and gym (D2 Use Class) hereby permitted shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the relevant premises and shall not operate other than in accordance with the agreed hours unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

30. Vegetation clearance outside of bird nesting season
All areas of hedges, scrub or similar vegetation where birds may nest which are to be removed as part of the development, are to be cleared outside the bird-nesting season (March - August inclusive) or if clearance during the bird-nesting season cannot reasonably be avoided, a suitably qualified ecologist will check the areas to be removed immediately prior to clearance and advise whether nesting birds are present. If active nests are recorded, no vegetation clearance or other works that may disturb active nests shall proceed until all young have fledged the nest.
Reason: To ensure that the proposed development does not adversely impact wildlife in accordance with national wildlife legislation and in line with CP36 of the Core Strategy. Nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended).

31. Hours of Construction
No demolition, construction or maintenance activities audible at the site boundary of any residential dwelling shall be undertaken outside the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 Saturday or at any time on Sundays and bank or public holidays without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority, unless the works have been approved in advance under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974.
Reason: To minimise noise disturbance.

32. Garages – restricting use and conversion to a habitable room
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no garages shall be permitted to convert into habitable rooms. Garages shall only be used or the storing of motor vehicles and bicycles and refuse storage.
Reason: To ensure adequate parking and cycle storage is maintained in the development.

33. Residential Permitted Development
Notwithstanding Classes A (including installation / replacement of guttering to a new design or in different materials, the rendering or cladding of a façade), B, C, D, E, F, G and H of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 or
any amending Order, no alterations to the building, buildings or extensions to buildings shall be erected or enacted at the dwelling houses or within their curtilage without the permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the character and appearance of the subject properties and surrounding area, to protect the amenities of the adjoining properties and to ensure adequate amenity space is provided.

Informatives

The weir bridge, whilst acceptable in principle, does not form part of this planning permission and requires separate detailed planning approval in consultation with the Local Planning Authority and the Environment Agency.

Any off-site highways works should be secured through an agreement under Section 278 of the Highway Act 1980, to be agreed with the Council

Thames Water would recommend that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities in basement car parks. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol / oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.

Swimming Pools - Where the proposal includes a swimming pool Thames Water requests that the following conditions are adhered to with regard to the emptying of swimming pools into a public sewer to prevent the risk of flooding or surcharging: - 1. The pool to be emptied overnight and in dry periods. 2. The discharge rate is controlled such that it does not exceed a flow rate of 5 litres/ second into the public sewer network.

Thames Water recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat trap on all catering establishments. We further recommend, in line with best practice for the disposal of Fats, Oils and Grease, the collection of waste oil by a contractor, particularly to recycle for the production of bio diesel. Failure to implement these recommendations may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and pollution to local watercourses. Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.

A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water's Risk Management Team by telephoning 02035779483 or by emailing wwqriskmanagement@thameswater.co.uk. Application forms should be completed on line via www.thameswater.co.uk/wastewaterquality.

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

This development is a 'phased planning permission' for the purposes of the CIL Regulations (2010) as amended (Reg 2(1)). For the avoidance of doubt a phase comprises the construction of one or more buildings or the change of use of any existing building, but does not include
demolition works, site preparation works, laying of any associated infrastructure, landscaping works or the laying of any estate roads.
Heritage Character Areas

A - Lakes and Cascade

The formal layout of the Lakes and Cascade has been restored to the original plan and with additional elements to enhance the setting. The intent is to ensure that the area is accessible and that interest is generated by the setting and views. Trees and shrubs will be retained to highlight the layout with additional planting to enhance the setting.

B - North Lawn, American Garden and Arboretum

The open landscape to the North Lawn and the American Garden has been carefully restored to the original design. The American Garden shall be planted up with interest planting and further attention will be given to correct the alignment of the boundary with the Georgian lawn to the north. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive expanse of grassland fringed with longer species rich grassland areas.

C - Ice House Wood and The Water Garden

The Ice House Wood provides an essential link between the North Lawn and the Water Garden. The proposal is to ensure that the Ice House Wood is reinstated to its original design intentions.

D - The Roman Walk and the Long Garden

The Roman Walk will be reinvested as a key component of the garden making and shall be maintained exclusively for public access.

E - The Daffodil Lawn

The Daffodil Lawn shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the glorious spring displays and the protection of the landscape. Trees will be maintained for the future.

F - The Walled garden

The Walled Garden shall be positively managed to retain some form of horticultural use with lines of fruit trees and raised beds along the southern boundary. The remainder of the space shall be given over to sympathetically designed housing along the down slopes.

G - The Wisteria Walk and the Long Garden

The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was added to the Orangery. Removal of this block will restore this view and the rond-point will be reinstated to its original design.

H - The Walled Garden

The semi-formal layout of the Walled Garden is kept much the same, and the walk in and out of the particular area, which serves as a natural extension of the servants quarters of the house and the entrance to the Orangery.

I - The Walled Garden

The key view of the Water Garden from the Walled Garden is retained. The boundary hedge of the Water Garden is retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored access only.

J - The South Lawn

The South Lawn will be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

K - The Long Garden

The Long Garden shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

L - The Great Dairy

The Great Dairy shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

M - The Walled Garden

The semi-formal layout of the Walled Garden is kept much the same, and the walk in and out of the particular area, which serves as a natural extension of the servants quarters of the house and the entrance to the Orangery.

N - The Walled Garden

The key view of the Water Garden from the Walled Garden is retained. The boundary hedge of the Water Garden is retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored access only.

O - The South Lawn

The South Lawn will be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

P - The Great Dairy

The Great Dairy shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

Q - The Walled Garden

The semi-formal layout of the Walled Garden is kept much the same, and the walk in and out of the particular area, which serves as a natural extension of the servants quarters of the house and the entrance to the Orangery.

R - The Walled Garden

The key view of the Water Garden from the Walled Garden is retained. The boundary hedge of the Water Garden is retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored access only.

S - The South Lawn

The South Lawn will be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

T - The Great Dairy

The Great Dairy shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

U - The Walled Garden

The semi-formal layout of the Walled Garden is kept much the same, and the walk in and out of the particular area, which serves as a natural extension of the servants quarters of the house and the entrance to the Orangery.

V - The Walled Garden

The key view of the Water Garden from the Walled Garden is retained. The boundary hedge of the Water Garden is retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored access only.

W - The South Lawn

The South Lawn will be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

X - The Great Dairy

The Great Dairy shall be positively managed to ensure the safe keeping of the landscape and the protection of the setting. Trees will be maintained for the future.

Y - The Walled Garden

The semi-formal layout of the Walled Garden is kept much the same, and the walk in and out of the particular area, which serves as a natural extension of the servants quarters of the house and the entrance to the Orangery.

Z - The Walled Garden

The key view of the Water Garden from the Walled Garden is retained. The boundary hedge of the Water Garden is retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored access only.
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Walls: Yellow/gault brick - Limestone dressings - Bronze finish cladding panels to upper floor.
Roof: EPDM rubber roof membrane to upper level. Cast stone over membrane to lower roof level.
Windows and Sliding doors: Slim profile bronze coloured metal.
Cills and window surrounds when shown: Limestone.
Balconies: Bronze coloured metalwork with frameless glass balustrading.
Basement wall grilles: Bronze coloured metalwork.
Entrance Canopy: Frameless glass and metalwork.
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**Walls:** Red brick and vertical tile hanging to gables
**Roof:** Plain tile.
**Window and external doors:** Powder coated slim profile metal.
**Cills:** Stone.
**Front porch/canopy:** Frameless glass.
**Dormers:** Hipped plain tile.
**Balconies:** Bronze coloured metalwork with frameless glass balustrading.
**Eaves:** Close cut timber soffit.
**Lintels:** Guaged brick.
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**Type T9**

- **Plan 187**
- **Walls** - Red brick
- **Roof** - Plain tile
- **Chimney** - Red brick
- **Joinery** - Painted timber
- **Door Type** - 4 panel door
- **Porch / Canopy** - Lead or zinc curved canopy supported on timber console brackets
- **Door Surround** - Reconstituted stone architecture
- **Dormer Type** - Plain tile roof
- **Exterior** - GRP or a stone cast Scotia cornice with Syan moulding
- **Feature Window** - /  
- **Bay Window** - Square bay window to front elevation
- **Sill** - Reconstituted stone
- **Additional Features** - Brick quions to front elevation; Glass balustrade to bracketed rear balcony at 1st floor; Conservation rooflights to rear

---

**T9 Gubbay Park Front Elevation**

**T9 Gubbay Park Rear Elevation**

**T9 Gubbay Park Side 1 Elevation**

**T9 Gubbay Park Side 2 Elevation**
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes.

All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

Type T9

Plan 49*, 51
Walls - Red brick
Roof - Plain tile
Chimney - Red brick
Joinery - Painted timber
Door Type - 4 panel door
Porch / Canopy - Lead or zinc curved canopy supported on timber console brackets
Door Surround - Reconstituted stone architrave
Dormer Type - Plain tile roof
Eaves - GRP or a stone cast Scotia cornice with Syms moulding
Feature Window - Oriel window to first floor
Bay Window - Square bay window to front elevation
Lims - Flat brick arches
Sills - Reconstituted stone
Additional features - Brick quions to front elevation; Glass balustrade to bracketed rear balcony at 1st floor; Conservation rooflights to rear

T9 Front Elevation

Plot 49 building plan is handed

T9 Side 1 Elevation

T9 Rear Elevation

T9 Side 2 Elevation

Scale 1:100

Note: (*) denotes building plan is handed

D 06/01/17 Door panels and dormers amended; finial added
C 28/11/16 Updates to door and canopy and GRP bay window
B 04/09/16 RE
A 31/08/16 Height dimensions added. Amend notes JR
Rev Date Description Initials

PROJECT: Former Middlesex University Campus
Trent Park
Site Development

TITLE: Revised T9 House Type - Elevations

SCALE: 1:100 @ A3

DATE: Aug 2016

DRAWN BY: __________
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent. Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

Type T8

Plots 112, 113
Walls - Red brick
Roof - Slate
Chimney - Brickwork above roof line
Joistery - Painted timber
Door Type - Raised and fielded 4 panel door with fanlight over
Porch / Canopy - Bracketed canopy
Door Surround - Reconstituted stone
Architecture
Eaves - Stepped/countered brick feature to flat fascia
Feature Window - Oriel window to 1st floor
Bay Window - /  /
Lintels - Rubbed brick - Flat arches
Sills - Reconstituted stone
Additional features: Projecting four course brick banding between ground and first floor level and at 2nd floor sill level

T8 semi plots 113/112 Front Elevation

T8 (Semi-Detached) Rear Elevation

PROJECT
Former Middlesex University Campus
Trent Park
Site Development

TITLE:
Revised T8 (Semi-Detached) House
Type - Front & Rear Elevations

SCALE:
1:100 @ A3

DATE:
2016/05

DRAWING No:
5902/PL338 D

DRAWN BY:
CH
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes.

No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

PROJECT: Former Middlesex University Campus Trent Park Site Development

TITLE: Revised T7A & T8A Combined Front & Rear Elevations

SCALE: 1:100 @ A3

DATE: Aug 2016

DRAWN BY: CH
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision.

Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site.

No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

Plot 13, 21, 27 building plans are handed.

Type T10:
Plots 13*, 18, 21*, 26, 27*, 32
Walls - render with brick quoins
Roof - Slate
Chimney - Brick
Facade - Painted timber
Door Type - 4 panel with fanlight over door
Porch - Canopy - Bracketed canopy
Door Surround - /
Window - /,
Lintel - Flat brick arch
Sills - Reconstituted stone
Additional features - Glass balustrade to bracketed rear balcony at 1st

---

T10 Rear Elevation
T10 Side 1 Elevation
T10 Side 2 Elevation
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision.

Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes.

All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

---

### T4+T7C Combined Rear Elevation

- **Materials:**
  - Walls: Red brick (with plinth)
  - Roof: Slate
  - Joinery: Painted timber

- **Details:**
  - Porch / Canopy: Braced steel canopy to front door
  - Door Surround: Reconstituted stone architraves
  - Eaves: Corbelled brick eaves
  - lintels: Rubble brick, flat arches
  - Sills: Reconstituted stone
  - Additional features: Glass balustrade to rear balcony, indented brick quoins

---

**Date:**
- **01/01/17:** Window sizes, eaves and roof amended
- **30/11/16:** Masonry arches added to one rear window and garage doors.
- **23/11/16:** Bathroom windows amended to square. Additional lighting to front columns.
- **08/09/16:** Titles updated
- **01/08/16:** Height dimensions added. Base to columns.
- **29/07/16:** Bathroom windows amended to square, quoins indented.

**Revisions:**
- **06/01/17:** Window sizes, eaves and roof amended. CH
- **08/09/16:** Titles updated
- **31/08/16:** Height dimensions added. Base to columns. Additional lighting to front columns.
- **30/11/16:** Masonry arches added to one rear window and garage doors.
- **23/11/16:** Bathroom windows amended to square. Additional lighting to front columns.
- **22/01/17:** Bathroom windows amended to square. Additional lighting to front columns. 

**Window Sizes:**
- **Type T4:**
  - **8,732:**
  - **5,862:**
- **Type T7C:**
  - **8,732:**
  - **8,732:**

---

**Adams Architecture**

Address: Old Hyde House, 75 Hyde Street, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 7DJ

Telephone: 01962 843843  Fax: 01962 843303

www.adamarchitecture.com  contact@adamarchitecture.com
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

PROJECT: Former Middlesex University Campus
Trent Park
Site Development

REVISIONS:

A 06/01/17 Door panel, fanlight updated
B 08/09/16 Text updates
C 31/08/16 Height dimensions added

DRAWING No: 5902/PL305 C

SCALE: 1:100 @ A3

DATE: Aug 2016

DRAWN BY: CH

**Note:** The drawing details the elevations of a building, including materials and features, with notes on revisions and dates.
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site.

No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground conditions is essential prior to work commencing. Assessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent, and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent. Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground conditions is essential prior to work commencing. Reassessment is essential when the ground conditions are apparent and redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions marked should be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site. No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent. General Notes: Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

Copyright © 2016 Adam Architecture Limited. All rights reserved. The information, images and drawings shown in this sheet are the copyright of Adam Architecture Limited and are confidential and confidential and must not be disclosed to any third party without the written consent of the Architect.
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**Project Information**

**Title:** Revised Street Elevations A and B

**Scale:** 1:200, 1:5000 @ A1

**Drawn By:** STS

**Date:** Aug 2016

**Drawing No:** 5032-PL601C

---

For a comprehensive understanding of the architectural plans and elevations, please refer to the attached diagrams and specifications. Each floor plan and elevation is meticulously detailed to ensure accurate representation and adherence to the original architectural vision.

---

**Project Details**

**Location:** Former Middlesex University Campus, Trent Park

**Architectural Firm:** ADAM ARCHITECTURE

**Contact Information:**
- London Office: 6 Queen Square, WC1N 3AT
- Hampshire Office: Old Hyde House, 75 Hyde Street, SO23 7DWW
- Telephone: 020 7841 0140
- Facsimile: 01962 843303
- Website: www.adamarchitecture.com
- Email: contact@adamarchitecture.com

---

**Legend:**
- Type T12 A: plot 1
- Type T11 B: plot 2
- Type T11 C: plot 19
- Type T11 D: plot 18
- Type T10: plot 18
- Type T8: plot 33
- Type T7 A: plot 47
- Type T8 A: plot 48
- Type T12 A: plot 39
- Type T12 A: plot 50
- Type T7 B: plot 40
- Type T7 B: plot 43
- Type T7 B: plot 45
- Type T7 B: plot 46
- Type T7 B: plot 49
- Type T12 A: plot 52
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision.

Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes.

All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site.

No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect.

The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

General Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.

ADAM ARCHITECTURE IS A TRADING NAME OF ADAM ARCHITECTURE LIMITED

LONDON OFFICE: 6 QUEEN SQUARE, WC1N 3AT
TELEPHONE: 020 7841 0140    FACSIMILE: 01962 843303
www.adamarchitecture.com  contact@adamarchitecture.com
TELEPHONE: 01962 843843  FACSIMILE: 01962 843303
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SCALE: 1:200, 1:5000 @ A1
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DRAWING No: 0902/PL602C

DRAWN By:

ELEVATION C

Type T10 plot 18
Type T11 A plot 17
Type T11 A plot 16
Type T11 A plot 15
Type T10 plot 14
Type T11 A plot 13
Type T11 A plot 12
Type T11 A plot 11

Datum 66m

Elevation D

Type T11 B plot 21
Type T11 B plot 20
Type T11 A plot 23
Type T11 A plot 22
Type T11 A plot 21

Datum 66m

Elevation F 1/2

Type T10 plot 27
Type T11 D plot 26
Type T11 D plot 25
Type T11 A plot 24
Type T11 A plot 23
Type T11 A plot 22
Type T11 A plot 21
Type T10 plot 20
Type T11 D plot 19

Datum 66m

Elevation F 2/2

Type T10 plot 15
Type T11 D plot 14
Type T11 D plot 13
Type T11 A plot 12
Type T10 plot 11
Type T10 plot 10
Type T11 A plot 9

Datum 66m

Type T10 plot 5
Type T10 plot 4
Type T10 plot 3
Type T10 plot 2
Type T10 plot 1

Datum 66m

Type T10 plot 26
Type T11 A plot 25
Type T11 A plot 24
Type T11 A plot 23
Type T11 A plot 22
Type T11 A plot 21
Type T10 plot 20
Type T11 D plot 19

Datum 66m

Type T10 plot 32
Type T7 A plot 31
Type T7 A plot 30
Type T7 A plot 29
Type T7 A plot 28
Type T7 A plot 27
Type T7 A plot 26
Type T10 plot 25

Datum 66m

Type T10 plot 34
Type T11 B plot 33
Type T11 D plot 32
Type T11 D plot 31
Type T12 A plot 30
Type T10 plot 29
Type T7 A plot 28
Type T7 A plot 27

Datum 66m
Adjacent Properties and Boundaries are shown for illustrative purposes only and have not been surveyed unless otherwise stated. All areas shown are approximate and should be verified before forming the basis of a decision. Do not scale other than for Planning Application purposes. All dimensions must be checked by the contractor before commencing work on site.

No deviation from this drawing will be permitted without the prior written consent of the Architect. The copyright of this drawing remains with the Architect and may not be reproduced in any form without prior written consent.

Ground Floor Slabs, Foundations, Sub-Structures, etc. All work below ground level is shown provisionally. Inspection of ground condition is essential prior to work commencing. Redesign may be necessary in the light of soil conditions found. The responsibility for establishing the soil and sub-soil conditions rests with the contractor.
GUIDE TO MATERIALS:

ROOF: TEAK COATED STAINLESS STEEL

FIRST FLOOR WALLS: BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING MANSON WEST WING
GROUND FLOOR WALLS: BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING MANSON WEST WING
LOWER GROUND FLOOR WALLS: BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING MANSON WEST WING
TERRACE WALLS: BRICK TO MATCH EXISTING MANSON WEST WING

WINDOWS (ALL): ARCHITECTURAL BRONZE

BREEZE SOLEIL: ARCHITECTURAL BRONZE FRAMES WITH HARDWOOD TIMBER SLATS

BEW DOWNSPRAYS: ALUMAEC HERITAGE CAST ALUMINIUM IN RECTANGULAR SECTION - DIAMETRICAL IN GRAPHSITE GREY (SANDBLAST DETAIL TO NORTH FACADE)
GUTTERS: ALUMAEC GX PREMIUM ALUMINIUM (SMOOTH) IN RECTANGULAR SECTION - DIAMETRICAL IN GRAPHSITE GREY
HOPPERS: ALUMAEC "HERITAGE" CAST ALUMINIUM REPOUK HOPPERS - DIAMETRICAL TO ACCOMODATE TWO OUTLETS IN GRAPHSITE GREY

PAVILION: LIGHTWEIGHT STEEL STRUCTURE WITH TEAK COATED STAINLESS STEEL ROOF AND PANELS TO MATCH BREEZE SOLEIL ON MAIN BUILDING

PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWING: NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION

GENERAL NOTES:
Survey drawings are based upon the drawings produced by Atcom, Jan 2016.

TRENT PARK, Enfield  Job No: 9716
PROPOSED: SOUTH ELEVATION - WEST WING HOUSES
PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWING: NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION SIDE DIMENSION AND DETAILS MUST BE TAKEN BY SPECIALIST CONTRACTOR.

DEMO

GENERAL NOTES:
Survey drawings are based upon the drawings produced by Ascon, Feb 2016.

This drawing is the copyright of Giles Quarme and Associates and cannot be printed or reproduced without prior permission.

Do not use.

You are not allowed to duplicate or reproduce the drawings for any purpose.

GILES QUARME AND ASSOCIATES
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PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWING: NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
SIDE DIMENSION AND DETAILS MUST BE TAKEN BY SPECIALIST CONTRACTOR.

GENERAL NOTES:
Survey drawings are based upon the drawings produced by Arcon, Feb 2016.
Access & Circulation Notes

1. Existing path just outside the red line provides good public access to the lake and cascade between the two lakes and should be retained. A stepped ramp needs to be provided to provide safe access down to lake edge path.

2. It is proposed to re-instate a link across the watercourse to re-connect the Mansion House with surrounding areas and the park.

3. The apse at the end of the pergola originally had a semi-circular seat, which will be reinstated. Re-establishment of an east west path to the north of the formal lawn linking the arboretum with the newly created rond-point will be retained to mark and screen the entrance to the West Wing. The Union Jack forecourt will be fully restored.

4. The garden rooms along the spine will be reinstated with a new path arrangement to provide public access.

5. The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built. Integral with these works additional drainage, scrub clearance, tree management, and enrichment of the garden with water features and planting is proposed.

6. The 19th century Arboretum and American Garden shall be enhanced with the reintroduction of informal flowering beds, as part of a programme of risk assessed planting of the 20th century and some of the original planting.

7. The Key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built.

8. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

9. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

10. The Long Garden is in a poor state of disrepair and is truncated with the addition of the Music Block.

11. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive garden space.

12. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive garden space.

13. The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built.

14. Integral with these works additional drainage, scrub clearance, tree management, and enrichment of the garden with water features and planting is proposed.

15. The 19th century Arboretum and American Garden shall be enhanced with the reintroduction of informal flowering beds, as part of a programme of risk assessed planting of the 20th century and some of the original planting.

16. The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built.

17. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

18. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

19. The Long Garden is in a poor state of disrepair and is truncated with the addition of the Music Block.

20. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive garden space.

21. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive garden space.

22. The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built.

23. Integral with these works additional drainage, scrub clearance, tree management, and enrichment of the garden with water features and planting is proposed.

24. The 19th century Arboretum and American Garden shall be enhanced with the reintroduction of informal flowering beds, as part of a programme of risk assessed planting of the 20th century and some of the original planting.

25. The key view from Wisteria Walk along the Long Garden to the statue at the rond-point was lost when the Music Block was built.

26. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

27. The Orangery and Pool Garden shall be faithfully restored to their original design intentions.

28. The Long Garden is in a poor state of disrepair and is truncated with the addition of the Music Block.

29. The Georgian lawn shall be reinstated with a formal mowing regime put in place to create an open cohesive garden space.
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<tr>
<td>Cockfosters</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: 16/04375/LBC

LOCATION:
Former Middlesex University Trent Park
Bramley Road
N14 4YZ

PROPOSAL: Demolition of extensions to Mansion House and restoration, conversion and extension to include its terrace and forecourt, demolition of extension to Orangery and restoration, conversion and extension to include swimming pool, together with restoration of Wisteria Walk and the registered park in association with phased redevelopment of the site under reference 16/04324/FUL.

Applicant Name & Address:
Berkeley Homes North East London LTD
c/o agent

Agent Name & Address:
Nathaniel Lichfield And Partners
14 Regents Wharf
All Saints Street
N1 9RL

RECOMMENDATION:
Listed Building Consent be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.
1. Site and Surroundings

1.1 Trent Park comprises a late 18th-Century landscape, park, lakes and woodland, developed throughout the 19th Century, and further developed in the early 20th Century by Sir Philip Sassoon with advice from Norah Lindsay.

1.2 The Listed Building Consent application site encompasses the Trent Park Registered Park and Garden (Grade II listed) and sits within the wider Trent Country Park (approximately 170 hectares). It is located to the north of Oakwood and the east of Cockfosters and lies within Trent Park Conservation Area. A number of statutory listed buildings and structures (Grade II) fall within the site boundaries. This application specifically relates to works to the Mansion House, The Orangery, Wisteria Walk and the Registered Park and Garden including associated statuary and landscape features.

1.3 The main vehicular access to the site is via Snakes Lane, a private road within the applicant’s ownership, which runs from the site to Bramley Road (A110). There is a private route through Trent Country Park to the west (Lime Avenue) which is only accessible by foot and cycle but provides emergency vehicle access.

1.4 Beyond the application site, but still within the applicant’s ownership, is the Southgate Hockey Club (subject to a long lease agreement). The Hockey Club’s informal car parking area, adjacent to Snakes Lane, is included within the planning application site boundary and works are proposed to formalise the parking arrangements. The applicant submitted a separate planning application (LPA ref. 16/05472/FUL) to deliver an overspill car park for the Hockey Club to the west of the existing car park and its all-weather pitches i.e. beyond the red line application boundary subject to the main planning application. This application was granted planning permission on 19 April 2017.

1.5 Immediately adjoining the site’s western boundary is the Wildlife Rescue Centre. There are private dwellings to the south-west (Rookery Cottages and Dairy House), south (South View and North View) and south-east (on Southern Lane). The Trent Park Golf Club lies to the south, farmland/woodland to the east, a lake and parkland to the north and further woodland/parkland to the west.

2. Historical Context

2.1 Trent Park originally formed part of the royal hunting forest of Enfield Chase and was later enclosed in 1780 in order to provide a residence for Dr Richard Jebb, physician to George III. Jebb’s house was located on the site of the current Mansion house, with the surrounding land landscaped in a grand 18th century fashion with pleasure grounds, set around a large lake.

2.2 The current Mansion comprises a late 19th-century house built in an early Georgian style. The house was altered and extended by successions of owners. Francis Bevan undertook a major remodelling of the house in the 1890s in an early Georgian style and later Philip Sassoon (1908-39) commissioned Charles Holden to remodel and re-case the house in a ‘Wrenaissance’ style, using reclaimed bricks and doorcases from demolished London mansion houses. Despite exuding a late 19th-century exterior, the house is thought to retain an earlier 19th-century core.

2.3 Sassoon also added number of key landscape features, including Wisteria Walk and introduced many new decorative elements to the gardens, including statues and obelisks salvaged from other country estates including Stowe and Wrest Park.

2.4 Stylistically the house is of 3 storeys and basement with projecting central and end bays of red brick with stone quoins, bands, window architraves and balustrade to parapet and basement areas. Thirteen timber-framed, sash and case windows with divided lights (6 over 6) can be seen to front elevation. The central doorcase has Corinthian entablature with a serpentine open pediment. Between each outer pair of ground floor windows, a classical statue can be seen set
2.5 Inside, a handsome suite of interconnecting reception rooms survive along the north front with
classical detailing. Of particular significance are the panels of mounted Chinese wall-paper and
painted decoration thought to be by Rex Whistler in the end rooms. There is also a fine entrance
hall and staircase. The terrace immediately adjacent to the house is currently included on the
Heritage at Risk Register due to its poor condition.

2.6 The Orangery is located to the immediate east of the Mansion House. Circa 1930, it was
designed by Col R Cooper for Sir Philip Sassoon incorporating early 18th century sculpture from
Wrest Park. Stylistically it comprises a single storey, red brick structure (Flemish Bond with stone
dressings) of five bays with canted end bays and flat roof over, set behind a parapet. The front
elevation is accessed via a stepped terrace overlooking a 1930s outdoor swimming pool. A late
20th-century former music block of no architectural or historical significance can be seen attached
to the rear. Each bay is punctuated by round-arched, small-pane French windows set below
fanlights with radial glazing bars. A continuous band runs below a coping parapet topped with
three sculptures each comprising a garlanded urn flanked by putti. The terrace is enclosed by
low brick walls which return to the Orangery as quadrants and terminate in plinths, featuring
Coade stone roundels of the seasons and supporting late 19th-century sphinxes. The Sphinxes
are Grade II listed in their own right. Very little of the original interior survives.

2.7 The Pergola, also known as Wisteria Walk, is located to the south east of the former Stable
Block. The structure consists of medieval Italian marble columns, linked by timber beams
supporting timber framework. Stylistically it is of 10 bays leading to an exedra at the south end.
The columns feature a variety of capitals. The Pergola is thought to date from 1914-15 and was
commissioned by Sir Phillip Sassoon.

2.8 Following Sassoon’s death in 1939, Trent Park was requisitioned by the Government and used as
an interrogation centre for German officers during the Second World War. The Combined
Services Detailed Interrogation Centre was run by a top secret unit, known as MI19. Rooms in
the Mansion House were equipped with hidden microphones that enabled the British ‘Secret
Listeners’ to listen to the German Officers' conversations in hidden a listening room that was
located in the Basement. Post war, the site fell into the ownership of Middlesex County Council
who converted the buildings into a teacher training facility. Thereafter the site was given over to
educational use, latterly operating as a campus for the Middlesex University. During the
University’s occupation many incongruous buildings were erected in the historic landscape and
some of the historic buildings were unsympathetically altered and extended, with little regard for
the historic buildings, their setting or the surrounding landscape. The educational buildings
undermine the legibility of the formal grounds, interrupting key views and historic relationships.

2.9 The site was vacated by Middlesex University in 2012 and purchased by the Alliance University
College of Medical Sciences (AUCMS) in 2013. AUCMS went into liquidation in November 2014.
The former university campus, which had been vacant for three years, was put up for sale and
eventually acquired by the applicants in September 2015.

3. Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets

3.1 Trent Park lies within the boundaries of the Trent Park Conservation Area. There are twelve
Statutory protected items included on the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic
Interest that are located within the site. These include two buildings and ten statues/
monuments. There are also four listed landscape features located in the wider setting of the
Park.

3.2 Trent Park and the Mansion Terrace are currently identified on Historic England’s Heritage at
Risk Register.

3.3 In addition to the key listed buildings that are the subject of discussion under this Listed Building
Consent Application, a number of small buildings associated with the Bevan and Sassoon Periods are still in existence that would have formerly supported the management of the Estate, including the Bothy, the Stable Block, the Dower House, the Gardener's House and the Rookery.

3.4 Listed buildings

1. Trent Park House (the Mansion) Grade II listed
2. Orangery with front terrace and wall with sphinxes Grade II listed

3.5 Listed statues and monuments

The Grade II listed statues and monuments within the site are:

1. Statues to north-east and north-west of terrace (Hercules wrestling with Antaeus, and Samson Wrestling with the Philistine)
2. Statue ('Time and Opportunity'), approximately 20 metres north-east corner of terrace
3. Pergola (known as Wisteria Walk) to south-east of former Stable Block
4. Gate pier with gate, Wisteria Walk
5. Pair of sphinxes flanking steps on east side of terrace
6. Urn on pedestal, approximately 25 metres to south-west of main entrance
7. Statue of Diana, to right of main entrance
8. Statue of Acteon, to left of main entrance
9. Monument to south-west of Trent Park, near to the west end of the Avenue (The Duchess's Column)
10. Pair of gate piers, approximately 25 meters to south-west of main entrance

3.6 Registered Historic Landscape

1. Trent Park Registered Park and Gardens Grade II listed

3.7 Grade II listed landscape features that form part of the wider historic landscape setting

1. West entrance gateway
2. Bollards at West entrance gateway
3. Obelisk on the west side of Moat Wood (the Needle Monument)
4. The Duke’s Column, south-east of Trent Park

3.8 Key non-designated heritage assets

1. The Stables (Locally listed)
2. Garden Cottage
3. The Bothy
4. Rookery Lodge
5. The Dower House

National Heritage List Entries for the above listed heritage assets can be found under Appendix A at the end of this report.

3.9. Built Heritage- Significance (Extract from Historic England Consultation Response)

3.10 Significance is defined by Historic England as the value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.
3.11 The key publication used to inform the assessment of the significance of heritage assets is *Conservation Principles*, English Heritage, 2008. The significance of Trent Park is set out below.

3.12 **Aesthetic**

The site is considered to be of high aesthetic significance. Despite the changes that occurred within the 20th century, the site still retains vestiges of its original picturesque character and retains many landscape features and buildings that are designed and executed to a high quality and sit comfortably within the context of the designed landscape.

3.13 **Historic**

The site is of considerable historic significance and retains a number of features dating back to its earliest occupation in the 18th century. The occupants and uses of the buildings also tell an interesting story, particularly the periods when the Mansion was occupied by Philip Sassoon, a leading socialite of the time, and during WWII, when the Mansion was used to house captured German generals and to listen in upon their conversations.

3.14 **Evidential**

The site is also considered to be of evidential significance, as there is a good possibility of the grounds and the house revealing more about the history of the site through further archaeological investigation.

3.15 **Communal**

The gardens and buildings are considered to be of high communal significance. They are well loved local landmarks, located adjacent to Trent Country Park. The grounds have been partly used by the public for recreational purposes for many years and are celebrated for their long and interesting history.

3.16 **Significance of Trent Park Conservation Area**

The significance of the Trent Park Conservation Area derives from the following:

- Its historic association with the Enfield Chase, a hunting park attached to the Manor of Enfield;
- Half of the total area is grade II listed on the Register of Parks and Gardens of historic interest;
- The topography continues to play a dominant role in determining the distinctiveness of the conservation area;
- The historic integrity of the estate has largely been preserved;
- The estate retains evidence of layers of change resulting from successive ownerships, uses, functions, and fashions; and
- Trees remain a very important element

3.17 **Archaeological Significance** (Extract from Historic England Consultation Response)

Enfield Chase and the pre-medieval landscape: potential for relict features of the Chase or earlier occupation. The evidence is admittedly sparse but there are recorded finds of Roman coins, the site of ‘Noddins (or Norrings) Well’, the site of the lodge which predated Trent House, the Rookery woodland and the alignment of Russell Riding along the southern edge of the site. The ridge line with its capping of gravel and glacial till along the southern part of the site together with
the spring indicated by Noddin’s Well would probably be more attractive for early settlement on
topographical grounds than the heavier London clay to the north.

3.19 The 18th to early 20th century country house and designed landscape: some of the standing
historic structures have (or may have) archaeological interest. Specifically the mansion must
have potential for hidden early fabric, and interpretation of its earliest phase appears
problematic. There is also, mainly noted in the DBA, potential for buried remains of earlier
features of the designed landscape, such as the ice house, former farm buildings, possible ha
ha, ponds and features associated with the gardens – notably the lost American Garden.

3.20 The WW2 Prisoner of War Camp/Interrogation Centre: although only a few wartime features are
still visible, the unusual nature of this facility makes the site of considerable historical interest
which adds to the significance of the listed structures and registered park. It means that
whatever does survive either above or below ground around them holds historical and
archaeological significance contributing to the conservation area and setting of the listed assets.
The WW2 interest includes the mansion’s basement, ruined pillbox and nissen hut but we also
need to better understand the layout and operation of the camp as a whole and consider the
possibility of hidden unrecorded structures or features – for example listening devices hidden in
walls or under floors, or unusual rubbish disposal (Red Cross parcels from Germany?).

4. Proposal

4.1 Listed Building Consent is sought for the following works:

a) The demolition of extensions to the Mansion House and its restoration;
b) conversion and extension (to include its terrace and forecourt);
c) demolition of extension to Orangery and restoration;
d) conversion and extension to include swimming pool;
e) restoration of Wisteria Walk and the registered park;
f) The restoration of the site’s listed heritage assets and their change of use as follows:
   i) The Mansion House to a mix of 980sqm of D1 use (museum/event space/ancillary
      café) in part of the ground floor and basement and residential C3 use in the
      remainder (15 dwellings);
   ii) The Orangery (plus a new extension) to 344sqm of D2 leisure use (gym), with full
      restoration of the swimming pool;
g) A landscape restoration scheme across the whole site including:
   i) Lakes and Cascade: clearance around the lake to enhance views from the
      Mansion North Lawn, American Garden and Arboretum: retention of specimen
      trees and reincorporation of others into pleasure grounds;
   ii) Reinstatement of late 19th Century grass terrace, Ice House Wood and the Water
      Garden;
   iii) Reinstatement of pleached lime avenue, Wisteria Walk and the Long Garden;
   iv) Reinstatement of lily ponds and the surrounding hedges;
   v) The Orangery and the Pool Garden: removal of shrubs and reduction of
      overgrown hedges to recreate historic proportions;
   vi) Daffodil Lawn: reinstatement of historic horticulture;
   vii) Walled Garden: repair of the walls, refurbishment of the central pool and axial
      paths;
   viii) Statues, urns and gates: revealing, cleaning and repair (as necessary) of currently
      boxed-in statutes, urns and gates.

h) Implementation and management: Adoption of a landscape management strategy for the
long-term upkeep of the Registered landscape;
i) Site-wide sustainable drainage system (SUD’s) incorporated into the historic landscape;
j) Repair and/or reinstatement of listed structures across the site, including decorative statues and gate piers

4.2 An associated application for Full Planning Permission appears elsewhere on the Agenda. The Application seeks the creation of new development within the site for residential purposes, comprising blocks of flats and single family dwellings. This development is principally located to the south and east of the Daffodil Lawn. Further development includes the creation of a new West Wing to the west of the Mansion and the provision of 4 new houses within the woodland area to the north of the Daffodil Lawn, known as the Glade.

5 Submitted Application Documents

5.1 The following documents were submitted to accompany the planning and listed building consent applications:

i) LPA Application Form;
ii) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Additional Information Form;
iii) Comprehensive set of planning and listed building consent drawings (to be listed in full on the decision notice);
iv) Design and Access Statement;
v) Landscape Design Statement;
v) Planning Statement with appended Alternative Uses Report
vii) Sustainability Statement;
viii) Energy Statement;
ix) Utilities Strategy;
x) Statement of Community Involvement;
x) Transport Assessment;
xii) Framework Travel Plan;
xiii) Delivery and Servicing Plan;
xiv) Construction Logistics Plan;
xv) Environmental Statement comprising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 01: Introduction</td>
<td>• Part 1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</td>
<td>• Appendix A: EIA Scoping and Consultation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 02: EIA Methodology</td>
<td>• Part 2: Heritage Assessment (with Historic Landscape Assessment and Built Heritage Assessment included as built-in appendices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 03: Alternatives and Design Evolution</td>
<td>• Part 3: Verified Views (Existing and Proposed)</td>
<td>• Appendix B: Operational Waste and Recycling Management Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 04: The Proposed Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix C: Health Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 05: Demolition, Construction and Refurbishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix D: Transport (including traffic data and any consultation responses);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 06: Socio-Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix E: Noise and Vibration (including any data, model outputs or N&amp;V specific glossary of terms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 07: Transportation and Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix F: Air Quality (including any data, model outputs, AQ neutral assessment etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 08: Noise and Vibration</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appendix G: Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 09: Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 10: Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Post-submission, the following plans / documents were also submitted:

i) Amended Planning and listed building consent drawings (including SUDs details);
ii) Addendum to the Design and Access Statement;
iii) Addendum to the Landscape Design Statement;
iv) Statement of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Conformity;
v) Addendum to the Transport Assessment;
vi) Updated CIL Additional Information Form
vii) Further Information and Clarification to Support the Ecological Impact Assessment.

6 Relevant Planning Decisions

6.1 The site has been the subject of various small scale applications for planning permission and listed building consent over the years which are relatively minor in nature. There have, however, been some major applications the most relevant of which are the two submitted in 2005 by Middlesex University:

i) TP/05/1058 - Detailed application (First Phase) for a new Learning Resource Centre with academic accommodation including a 200 seat lecture theatre and associated facilities, new 3-storey student residential building for 100 students with ancillary space, cycle and disabled facilities and associated plant and servicing, including new substation / chillers and refuse compound area, as well as new landscaping and surfacing works around both buildings.

ii) TP/05/1168 - Outline Planning Application (siting and means of access) for the development of the existing University Campus at Trent Park involving the construction of up to 24,700 sq. m. of non-residential institution floor space (Use Class D1), up to 10,000 sq. m. of student residential accommodation (providing accommodation for up to 382 students), 250 car parking spaces, improved access and bus turn around facilities at the southern end of Snakes Lane involving the removal of the Lodge building, pedestrian crossing facility (Bramley Road), ancillary services, facilities, associated roads, paths and other infrastructure, together with associated landscape improvements.

6.2 These applications were considered by the Council’s Planning Committee in January 2006 with an officer recommendation to approve. After consideration at the meeting, the recommendation was not accepted and both were refused planning permission for the following reason:

“The proposed development by virtue of its size, siting and scale would have inappropriate regard to the character and surroundings of Trent Park resulting in a form of development that would be inappropriately located in the Green Belt detrimental to its character and appearance contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 and (I) G1, (II) G1, (II) G11 as well as Policies (I) GD1 and (II) GD1 of the Unitary Development Plan”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Contamination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 11: Water Resources, Drainage and Flood Risk</td>
<td>• Appendix H: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 12: Archaeology (Buried Heritage)</td>
<td>• Appendix I: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 13: Ecology</td>
<td>• Appendix J: Ecology (including all ecology reports); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 14: Effect Interactions</td>
<td>• Appendix K: Arboriculture (including Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 15: Residual Effects and Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chapter 16: Glossary of Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Pre-application Consultation

London Borough of Enfield

7.1 A number of pre-application meetings were held between the applicant’s consultant team and Officers between September 2015 and submission of the application in September 2016. The scheme has also been presented to the Council’s Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) on four occasions, an Enfield Planning Panel and to a Design Review Panel (via Urban Design London).

7.2 A Working Group (The Trent Park Working Group) was established at the request of Full Council in response to the imminent sale of the site, made up of cross party local Councillors including the Ward Councillors. The applicant met with the Working Group on six occasions between October 2015 and August 2016 (prior to formal submission).

Statutory Consultees

7.3 Pre-application meetings were held with the GLA and Historic England throughout 2016.

Non-Statutory Consultees

7.4 The Trent Park Community Council was set up by the applicant to include representatives of 18 key local interest groups and stakeholders with a specific interest in the progress of the proposed development at the site. There were six meetings between November 2015 and August 2016.

Community Groups

7.5 In addition to the Community Council meetings the applicant has advised that they have attended meetings with groups such as Friends of Trent Park and the Save Trent Park Campaign. They have also met Enfield Wildlife Rescue and Ambulance Service and the Southgate Hockey Club to try to ensure their operational requirements are fully considered.

Community Engagement

7.6 Members may be aware that the applicant organised a total of four public consultation events prior to submission of the application. Each event ran over three days (Friday to Sunday):

4th – 6th December 2015
26th – 28th February 2016
13th – 15th May 2016
8th – 10th July 2016.

7.7 A further post submission exhibition was held over two days on 4-5 November 2016. These public exhibitions were advertised in local newspapers and the applicant also prepared newsletters which were delivered to 8,000-10,000 local residents, with 500 to key local stakeholders. The applicant has confirmed that over 1,850 people attended across the five exhibition dates. A dedicated website was also set up by the applicant to provide details of the application, consultation materials and a method for stakeholders to submit feedback and any questions. This website continues to be available.

7.8 In addition to this, in order to keep users of the wider Trent Country Park up to date on the proposals, the applicant erected two noticeboards on the site (following the granting of separate planning permissions from the Council), one at the eastern end of Lime Avenue and the other at the eastern end of Southern Lane. These boards provide opportunities to display updates on the scheme as well as information on upcoming events.

8. Consultations
8.1 Statutory and non-statutory consultees

8.1.1 Urban Designer

Revision of the architectural approach and treatment of elevations to the apartment blocks have addressed previous concerns over their appearance competing with the Mansion House across Daffodil Lawn. The submitted drawings are now acceptable in design terms, with the exception over the same caveats relating to materials and detailing as elsewhere that can be covered through suitable conditions.

Walled Garden

8.1.2 The contemporary approach to the walled garden portion of the scheme is supported. The design has carefully taken cues from the historic context of the walled garden itself, with the composition of elevations well considered and balanced. Again, the final design will need to be supported through high quality materials and detailing through suitable conditions.

Orangery Extension

8.1.3 Further revisions to the orangery extension were submitted in April, addressing previous concerns over the plan form of the extension in relation to the Orangery building. The revised approach creates a symmetrical built footprint and elevation treatment that sits more comfortably against the symmetrical plan of the Orangery and its alignment with the swimming pool to the west.

8.1.4 A suitable response to the historic landscape has been achieved through the inclusion of hedging to reflect the offset geometry of the historic landscape when compared against the Orangery.

8.1.5 The revised drawings as submitted do not include the detail of the junction between the Orangery and extension. We have previously recommended that this junction should incorporate a glazed section using structural glazing, to ensure there is a clear visual break between the external wall of the Orangery and new extension. We had provided some examples as to how this could be achieved. Given the late stage, this element should be covered by suitable condition to ensure that this detail can be successfully realised.

Landscape and Boundary Treatments

8.1.6 Supportive of the overall approach, although the detail of boundary treatments throughout the scheme should be covered by suitable condition.

Tree Officer

8.1.7 No arboricultural objection. Trees to be removed are either of limited heritage or amenity value and the extensive proposed mitigating landscape and tree planting will in the long-term bring significant benefits to the locality and outweigh the removal of the trees proposed. Some elements of tree removal are to re-instate elements of historical landscaping.

8.1.8 The proposed landscaping, tree planting and commitment from the developer to manage the site with arboricultural issues a key component of the development is very encouraging and the extensive pre-consultation has been very beneficial for the development in terms of the arboricultural considerations.

8.1.9 Conditions will be required regarding detailed tree protection, heritage tree and woodland management and landscape tree planting. The proposed SUDS swales and ponds will need to be located so as not to harm the roots of retained trees. Routing of services and utilities will need
to be carefully considered so as not to detrimentally harm trees and conform to any submitted Tree Protection Plan.

Greater London Authority (GLA)

8.1.10 The Mayor’s Office has been consulted on both the planning application and listed building consent application. His comments are set out in full in the planning application report. In terms of historic heritage he advises that the proposal would significantly enhance the setting of the Listed and Locally Listed Buildings at the site and significantly enhance the character of the Trent Park Conservation Area.

Historic England

8.1.11 Due to the Grade II listed Status of the buildings, Historic England have not provided formal comments on the Listed Building Consent application. However, they have provided detailed advice throughout the application stage. For the benefit of Members, their advice on the Full Planning Application and subsequent revisions is précised below.

8.1.12 Overall they support the principle of the redevelopment of the site. However they have in considering the proposal raised the following issues:

- concern in relation to the location of the SUDs ponds in the landscape and these were subsequently amended within the 20 January 2017 submission;
- queried the proposed SUDs water channel across the Daffodil Lawn; this was worked up in further detail with Historic England and formed part of the submitted documentation;
- raised queries in relation to the terrace on the North Lawn, which were clarified by the applicant.
- queried the design approach to The Glade area, which was subsequently amended in the 20 January 2017 submission.

8.1.13 They suggest conditions in relation to details of public access to the site and a landscape maintenance plan, and that permitted development rights are removed for the new houses (included under the draft conditions/S106 heads of terms).

8.1.14 Historic England formally responded to the consultation on the revisions in March 2017. They suggest a number of conditions in the event that any consent is granted, but they also indicate that there are some remaining matters which they are keen to be clarified prior to any development commencing:

- Impact of the proposals on the significance of the Registered Landscape.
- Shared Surface through the western part of the Daffodil Lawn.
- Public access to the open landscaped areas and links through to the public park.
- The Glade Development.

8.1.15 It is considered that the points raised are important, but that there remains sufficient control, principally through the suggested draft conditions, in order to ensure that the development is acceptable and does not have a detrimental impact on Trent Park.

8.1.16 Details of the hard and soft landscaping scheme throughout the site, including the North Lawn and the lower Mansion terrace, will need to be agreed before any landscaping works commence on site and draft conditions 7 (Tree Protection), 10 (North Lake Buffer Zone Details) and 18 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) will allow the impact on the sensitive Registered
Landscape to be carefully considered. Similarly, the detail of the proposed SuDS system will be considered through draft condition 12 (Sustainable Drainage Strategy) covering amongst other things the final appearance of the proposed water channel across the Daffodil Lawn. An existing tarmac surfaced vehicular route across the centre of the Daffodil Lawn is to be removed and replaced by an infiltration trench and grassed pedestrian footpath. This would move vehicles away from the important Daffodil Lawn and would actually reduce the amount of hard surfacing to the Daffodil Lawn so providing a net gain in greenery in this part of the site. It is important to note that Officers have consistently made it clear that the attractive Union Jack forecourt to the front of the Mansion should be closed to traffic (other than in the case of access for emergency vehicles) in order to protect it. This means that any access to the Mansion House, the West Wing and The Glade for servicing/deliveries has to be from the west, rather than the east and across the forecourt. Although this requires the introduction of a small area of gravel surfacing to the west of the Lawn it is considered that the benefits outweigh any concern in this respect.

8.1.17 The proposal provides ungated public access to over 12ha of open space within Trent Park, along with over 3km of walking and cycling routes that link into the Country Park. The applicants have confirmed that although there will be parts of the site which will not be accessible to the public these are restricted to those areas shown as private or communal amenity space in the submission. Draft condition 18 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) requires under part k) that details of all public, private and communal amenity spaces, and how access to them will be managed, are submitted to the Council for approval. Furthermore, the draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Legal Agreement includes details of public access across the site. This also allows the security of requiring a landscape management plan for the site.

8.1.18 As far The Glade is concerned, HE have maintained concern over this element throughout the process. Amendments have been made to The Glade which LBE Officers have confirmed were positive, more suited to this location with the building heights and massing considered to respond better to the existing site levels. The balance here with the amendment to the northern extent of The Glade boundary is that two new publically accessible routes through the woodland in this part of the site are now provided, along with an area of accessible open space (approx. 400 square metres). Photographic assessment of views through the adjacent woodland, as well as details of additional screen planting proposed along the site boundary, were provided as part of the updated Design & Access Statement and have helped to demonstrate to Officers that the impact of this element would be acceptable. It is acknowledged that there will be an increase in the amount of building in this part of the site and that there has been a view, including from Officers at HE, that there should be no development here. However, it is considered that it would be appropriate to take something of a pragmatic view and that the proposed site-wide development will have a major beneficial effect on the Mansion itself, as well as on Trent Park Registered Park and the Conservation Area. Considering the development as a whole and the benefits that it will have on the wider Park and a number of heritage assets, it is the opinion of Officers that The Glade element is, on balance, acceptable and this conclusion is not outweighed by other concerns.

GLAAS

8.1.19 No objection subject to condition (as listed at the end of this Committee Report).

Enfield Archaeological Society

8.1.20 They emphasised the heritage significance of this location, but considered that this has been adequately considered in the planning application documentation and satisfactory proposals made to ensure that any heritage assets likely to be impacted are preserved by record.

Trent Park Conservation Committee

8.1.21 Issues raised by the Committee are covered on the report on the Full Planning Application.
The Groups observations on the proposals for Trent Park are set out in the planning application report.

Public Consultation

A total of 5956 letters were sent to addresses advising them of the applications in October 2016. In addition, a total of 33 site notices were posted both within the Country Park, but also at entrances and routes to it on 24 October 2016.

The applications (both Planning & Listed Building Consent) were the subject of a Press Notice on 5 October 2016 advertising the proposals as Development affecting Listed Buildings, the setting of Listed Buildings, a Registered Park & Garden within the Trent Park Conservation Area.

A number of key design changes were made to the scheme as a result of consultation feedback including the following:

- Relocation of the north-eastern SUD pond and updates to the SUDs Strategy
- Removal of proposed trees in the North Lawn area to restore the open character of the lawn.
- Additional cycle stands for visitors to the Orangery, museum and play area
- The re-orientation of the eastern house, plot 44, on Wisteria Drive
- Relocation of apartment blocks on Southern Lane and two additional car parking spaces
- New design for the Woodland Glade character area
- Minor Changes to the external elevations of the house types and apartment buildings
- Additional Detail on the Orangery design.
- Alterations to the proposals for the Mansion House light-wells, retaining them in their historic positions.

In response to this a further round of public consultation, with another 5956 letters, took place in January 2017.

A number of responses have been in received in relation to the consultation exercise which are summarised on the associated planning application report.

Relevant Policy and Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990

Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Chapter 9, refer to setting. Section 16(2) states: ‘In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historical interest which it possesses.’ In addition, Section 66(1) states: ‘In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses’.

The London Plan

Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 7.9 Heritage-led regeneration

9.3 Core Strategy
CP30: Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment
CP31: Built and landscape heritage

9.4 Development Management Document
DMD37 Achieving High Quality Design-Led Development
DMD38 Design Process
DMD44 Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets
DMD81 Landscaping

9.5 Other Relevant Policy Considerations
National Planning Policy Framework
National Planning Practice Guidance
LBE S106 SPD (2016)
Trent Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2015)
Trent Park Conservation Area Management Proposals (2015)
Enfield Characterisation Study
Enfield Council Tall Buildings Study
Setting of Heritage Assets
Conservation Principles

10. Analysis

10.1 Statutory background

10.2 Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“Listed Buildings Act”) confirm that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting (s.66) and preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area (s.72). As confirmed by the Court of Appeal (Civil Division), the decision in Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council [2014] EWCA Civ 137, it was concluded that where an authority finds that a development proposal would harm the setting of a listed building or the character and appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm “considerable importance and weight”. Further case law has reconfirmed the Barnwell decision and the considerations to be undertaken by a planning authority: The Forge Field Society & Ors, R v Sevenoaks District Council [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin), Pugh v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 3 (Admin).

10.3 National Guidance

10.4 Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (“Conserving and enhancing the historic environment”) advises Local Planning Authorities to recognise heritage assets as an “irreplaceable resource” and to “conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance” (para.126). Paragraph 132 goes on to say LPAs need to consider whether a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset. Proposals that lead to substantial harm to or a total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or it meets with the test identified at paragraph 133. Where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use (para. 134). The NPPF states that heritage assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the Local Planning Authority (including local listing).
At paragraph 137, LPAs are also advised to look for opportunities for new developments within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to better reveal their significance. Where a proposal preserves those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. The NPPG advises that the extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which the asset is experienced is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places.

Paragraph 135 provides guidance in relation to non-designated heritage assets. The development proposal must also be assessed against the significance of the heritage asset, and "a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset".

London Plan policy 7.8 ("Heritage Assets and Archaeology") advises what boroughs should do at a strategic level to identify, preserve, and enhance London’s heritage assets. Policy CP31 ("Built and Landscape Heritage") of the Core Strategy sets out a requirement that development should conserve and enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets. Policy DMD44 ("Conserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets") states that development which fails to conserve and enhance the special interest, significance or setting of a heritage asset will be refused. The design, materials and detailing of development affecting heritage assets or their setting should conserve the asset in a manner appropriate to its significance.

The heritage assets upon which the impact of the development should be considered are the various listed features referenced elsewhere in this report. What must therefore be determined is whether any of the elements proposed will harm the significance of the heritage assets, having regard to the statutory requirement to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area (s.72). If any harm is identified, great weight must be given to that harm. Further to this, as advised above, if substantial harm or total loss to significance is identified, it would need to be established whether there are any substantial public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm or loss or the tests identified at para.133 of the NPPF are met. If there is less than substantial harm, the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, and for undesignated heritage assets, a balanced judgement must be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. It should be noted that benefits are not limited to heritage benefits but to all material planning benefits capable of meeting the policy tests.

Discussion of key works

For the benefit of Members, a discussion of the key works contained within the Listed Building Consent application is outlined below.

Demolition of extensions to the Mansion House and its restoration

The proposals are for the demolition of extensions and restoration of the Mansion House; and for its conversion and extension including terrace and forecourt.

Specifically the proposed works include:

i) The restoration of historic features to the Ground Floor
ii) Creation of a community/ hireable/ museum space with ancillary café. Details of this will be covered under a separate LBC at a later date.
iii) Creation of residential flats at first floor level
iv) Creation of duplex flats at second and attic floor with the addition of dormer windows at attic level
v) Creation of a service court west wing
vi) Creation of undercroft car park and refuse store
vii) Insertion of cast iron grilles to cover flue extracts at first floor and basement level
viii) Insertion of flue extract at roof level for second floor duplex flats
ix) Replacement of roof covering with lead to LSA specification standards.

**Restoration and conversion of Mansion House**

10.11 The restoration and conversion of the Mansion House to its original use (Class C3) with public access to principle rooms at ground and lower ground floor level through a community facility use, is considered an appropriate use of this designated heritage asset. A sensitive approach to the subdivision of the upper floors into apartments and duplexes off the main corridors means that existing and historic partitions will be reused, thereby minimising the impact on the existing plan form and historic fabric. In addition, at ground floor level where most of the historic fabric survives to the principle rooms, full paint and wall paper analysis is to be undertaken to ensure that the ground floor rooms are faithfully restored. The wall paintings attributed to Rex Whistler, will also be carefully restored by specialists. All conservation works will be conditioned to ensure that the appropriate level of detail is submitted to the LPA, prior to the commencement of works.

**Extension of Mansion House to create West Wing**

10.12 Concerns were initially raised by LBE Officers relating to the creation of a new west wing to the Grade II listed Mansion House Building, following the proposed demolition of the existing late 20th Century extension. At the request of officers, extensive historical research was undertaken by Giles Quarme Architects who found that there is a historical precedent for a service wing attached to the Mansion House building, dating back to the early 19th century. Further archive information pertaining to this can be found in ES Volume II: Landscape, Visual Impact, Built Heritage and Historic Landscape Assessment Part 2 of 3: Heritage Assessment [p.69-70]. Once the principle of development had been established, the impact of the new wing upon the setting of the Mansion House was given careful consideration and amendments to the position, building line, height, massing and design were sought in order to minimise its impact. Further details at a scale of 1:20 have been requested under the attached draft conditions to show the design of the proposed west wing in more detail and specifically, how it will affix to the Grade II listed building. The draft conditions also prescribe that any demolition should be undertaken by hand, to minimise the impact to the existing historic building.

10.13 Additional concerns were also raised by LBE Heritage Officers regarding the positioning of the proposed dormers and the design of the new entrance portico. The submission of additional supporting information was duly requested to provide a clear and convincing justification for the proposed works. In response, further structural information was submitted to show that existing structural constraints limited the placement of the proposed dormers. A historical justification for the design of the proposed entrance portico was also supplied to Officers, who were then satisfied with the proposed works.

**Undercroft and refuse store**

10.14 Although the proposed undercroft parking and refuse store is supported in principle, further details are required of the proposed design. It is therefore recommended that the submission of further details of this element be conditioned accordingly for approval in writing by the LPA prior the commencement of the Mansion House phase of works.

**Mansion House Internal alterations**

10.15 The Listed Building Consent application is supported by a comprehensive Condition Survey, internal plans and elevations and details of proposed internal alterations and repair works. LBE Heritage Officers are satisfied with the proposals in principle, however discussion surrounding minor internal proposals for the Mansion House such as the detailing of internal features and conservation is ongoing. An update will be provided at the meeting.

**Demolition of extension to Orangery and restoration and conversion and extension to**
Under the proposed scheme, the existing late 20th Century extension to the Orangery will be demolished and replaced with a new light weight extension to the rear. The Orangery (including Coade stone statues) and swimming pool will be sensitively restored. The Orangery will be used as a gym and a cafe area with access to the swimming pool.

Specifically the proposed works include:

- Restoration of ground floor
- Creation of gym with ancillary café
- Creation of new glazed extension with living trellis wall
- Insertion of flue extract at roof level
- Replacement of roof covering with lead to LSA specification standards.

LBE Heritage and Design Officers raised concerns over the plan form, orientation and design of the proposed extension to the Orangery and requested amendments to the design to provide a fully glazed lightweight building set on a simple rectangular plan form, omitting the green roof.

Amendments were sought to address these concerns and the proposals were revised accordingly. The revised design comprises a rectangular double-glazed extension with central arched opening, comprising flat and curved glass units sitting within minimal cast aluminium structural supports. The extension is bordered by hedging to match that of the restored Norah Lindsay scheme. There is now consensus amongst officers that the previous issues with the design of the proposed extension to the Orangery are overcome in latest design. However, further details are required to show junctions/ how the extension will be affixed to the existing Grade II listed building/ the trellis, in addition to method statements and further details of the proposed restoration works to the Swimming Pool and the Orangery. It has also been strongly recommended that any demolition should be undertaken by hand, to minimise the impact to the existing historic building. A draft condition has been attached to this effect.

In addition, no internal elevations have been submitted showing the proposed restoration works/ creation of gym with ancillary cafe to the Orangery. As such, conditions pertaining to these elements have been drafted accordingly.

Concerns were raised by Historic England in relation to proposals to install a sustainable urban drainage system within the historic designed landscape and Grade II listed registered park and garden. The proposals were revised accordingly. The detail of the proposed SuDS system will be considered through draft Condition 6 a) (Sustainable Drainage Strategy) covering, amongst other things, the final appearance of the proposed water channel across the Daffodil Lawn. An existing tarmac surfaced vehicular route across the centre of the Daffodil Lawn is to be removed and replaced by an infiltration trench and grassed pedestrian footpath. This would move vehicles away from the important Daffodil Lawn and would actually reduce the amount of hard surfacing to the Daffodil Lawn so providing a net gain in greenery in this part of the site.

The Councils 2012 Trent Park Planning Statement was prepared to help guide future investors on the proper and appropriate planning of the whole site. The Statement established a list of appropriate/compatible alternative uses beyond education in recognition that if properly evidenced, the site may no longer be required for educational use. The applicant has produced an Alternative Uses Report (AUR) which has assessed in detail eight uses from a residential- led
scheme to a high-end sport and leisure scheme and a combination of a compatible mix. The
applicant has provided a comprehensive assessment of a range of future options to conclude
that a residential-led scheme with public access to the Mansion House through a D1 community
use to include museum with event space and an ancillary café is the most appropriate way
forward to secure the long term protection and enhancement of both the site’s built and
landscape heritage. Officers are satisfied that the assessment undertaken by the applicants is
sufficiently thorough and demonstrates that it would be reasonable to allow the loss of the
educational use from the Trent Park site.

Museum in the Mansion House

10.23 Members will be very aware of a well-supported local campaign relating to the future use of the
Mansion building with particular reference to recognising the role that Trent Park played in the
Second World War. The Trent Park Museum Trust has been formed in order to assist in this
recognition. The applicants have taken account of this campaign in the evolution of their
proposals and produced an “Outline Concept and Business Case” document that was submitted
as part of the application proposals.

10.24 As discussed elsewhere, the proposal involves the restoration and refurbishment of the Mansion
and the removal of the existing unsightly buildings originally built as part of the former University
buildings. In doing so this enables public access to, and use of, the Mansion House for the first
time in its history with a long-term sustainable museum, café and events space which is
something that the Trust have been keen to secure.

10.25 The scope of the Business Case was to consider how a new Museum, set within the Historic
Mansion House, might work. The applicants have indicated that their project seeks to:

- Create a viable and sustainable cultural experience.
- Preserve the heritage and celebrate the history of the Mansion House and grounds.
- Appeal to a range of audiences and connect a wide range of stakeholders.
- Provide dynamic and experiential displays that bring history to life”.

10.26 The redevelopment provides the opportunity to tell the story of the Mansion in its original context
with part of the ground floor and basement accessible to the public for the first time with an
exhibition space dedicated to celebrating the exceptional features of the grounds, the Mansion
House, and the events that occurred there.

10.27 Although the Mansion has evidently had a very interesting history, at the core of the proposed
Museum is the opportunity to interpret Trent Park’s history through spoken word. The details of
how this will happen will be clarified in due course and are not something that the Planning
Authority needs to be involved with, certainly at this stage, but reference has been made that in
order to learn the value of information transferred between the visitors, listening points could be
located in the grounds where bugging devices were placed in the Second World War. The
conversations that took place could be dramatized in several ways, through live interaction with
the host, the Audio Visual (AV) experience, listening points and an audio interactive guide, but
that is detail for future considerations.

10.28 Whilst the attraction of, and local support for, establishing “Trent Park-The Listening Museum” is
understood for the reasons set out above, it is important to acknowledge that there is not a
specific planning reason to insist on the provision of such a museum over and above any other
form of community facility. Alternatives have been considered by the applicants in their
Alternative Use Assessment, some of which would also provide a viable use for the museum that
would meet the community needs of the Borough, and there is nothing in planning terms that
would allow the Local Planning Authority to insist on the provision of this particular museum.

10.29 However, this is something of an academic point because Officers have consistently encouraged
the applicants to actively consider the aspirations of the Trust (which they have been happy to
do) and this museum is something that the Planning Authority can support. In addition, as
Berkeley Homes have reached a formal agreement with the Trent Park Museum Trust in order to secure the provision of the Museum, café and community space, it is hoped that in the event that the development does come forward across the site, the provision of public access to the Mansion would be a key part of that.

**Vehicular Access**

10.30 It is important to note that Officers have consistently made it clear that the Union Jack forecourt to the front of the Mansion should be closed to traffic (other than in the case of access for emergency vehicles) in order to protect it. This means that any access to the Mansion House, the West Wing and The Glade for servicing/deliveries has to be from the west, rather than the east and across the forecourt. Although this requires the introduction of a small area of gravel surfacing to the west of the Lawn it is considered that the benefits outweigh any concern in this respect.

The main access for vehicles will be along Snakes Lane from Bramley Road.

**Public Access to the Park and Listed Mansion**

10.31 It is noted that pedestrians and cyclists will be able to use the main access route along Snakes Lane and this approach, in light of proposed improvements, is acceptable. It is further noted that the public will be able to use the proposed courtesy bus and that the museum will provide information to visitors about parking, public transport availability and using the courtesy bus.

10.32 The updated proposals for community / leisure uses, in the form of a museum and café, will have an impact on the number of visitors to the site. Throughout the pre-application process the assumption has been that this use will not have on-site car parking provision, other than a limited number of disabled parking spaces and a short-stay / drop off facility for coaches. This approach will limit the impact on the Snakes Lane access and should also encourage the use of sustainable modes (as noted there is visitor parking available to the west of the site).

11 Conclusion

11.1 The proposed development affects several Grade II listed buildings and structures sited within a Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden. Therefore the proposal must be assessed against the level of harm, if any, to the identified heritage assets.

11.2 The application is for the demolition of extensions to the Mansion House and its restoration, conversion and extension (to include its terrace and forecourt); the demolition of the extension to Orangery and restoration, conversion and extension to include swimming pool, together with restoration of Wisteria Walk and the registered park in association with phased redevelopment of the site under reference 16/04324/FUL.

11.3 The main issues to consider therefore are the impact of the proposal on the Grade II listed buildings and structures of special architectural and historic interest in terms of preserving and enhancing its special interest having regard to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology of the London Plan, Core Policy 31 Built and Landscape Heritage, Policy DMD44 of the Development Management Document Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets, National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

11.4 The proposed works will safeguard and bring back into use the Grade II listed buildings and registered park and garden and ensure that they are no-longer at risk. The proposals are in keeping with the special character and appearance of the existing buildings and subject to the conditions recommended will not cause harm to their historic fabric, interest or setting.
Moreover, several buildings noted as making a negative contribution to the Character of the Conservation Area and detracting from the setting of existing listed buildings and structures will be removed under the proposed scheme, whilst the historic landscape will be restored.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed works will not harm the special interest of the Grade II listed buildings and structures or their settings, or that of the Grade II Listed Park and Garden having regard to Core Policy 31 of the Core Strategy, London Plan Policy 7.8, DMD 44 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

Taking all material planning considerations into account it is considered that the development should be approved for the following reasons:

Having regard to the statutory requirement to give special attention to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting (s.66) the proposal has been assessed against the identified heritage assets and their significance as set out above. It is considered that the development proposals will not lead to any harm to the designated heritage assets, having regard to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology of the London Plan, Core Policy 31 Built and Landscape Heritage, Policy DMD44 of the Development Management Document Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets, National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

12 **Recommendation**

12.1 Listed Building Consent be GRANTED subject to the conditions set down below.

1. C60 Approved plans

   The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, as set out in attached schedule 1 which forms part of this notice.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. C53A Time Limit - Listed Building Consent

   The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the decision notice.

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by S.51 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

3. Works of Making Good

   Unless required by any other condition, all new works and finishes and works of making good to the retained fabric to all listed buildings, shall match the existing adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture, profile, brickwork, pointing and facebond unless shown otherwise on the drawings or other documentation hereby approved or required by any condition(s) attached to this consent.

   Reason: In order the safeguard the architectural and historic interest of these Grade II Listed Buildings and structures.

4. Repair Samples

   Where surfaces, materials or fittings are to be repaired, a sample of the repair shall firstly be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The repair works shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved detail.
Reason: In order the safeguard the architectural and historic interest of these Grade II Listed Buildings and structures.

5. Incorporation of features

All existing historic fabric (including bricks, rainwater goods, slates, windows, doors, lintels, cills) shall be salvaged where possible and used/incorporated in the works hereby authorised.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

6. Demolition by hand

Any works of demolition shall be carried out by hand only and the materials safely stored for re-use in the building to be erected on the site.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

7. Demolition Linked to Redevelopment

Works for the demolition of the building hereby permitted shall not be commenced before a valid contract for the carrying out and completion of works of redevelopment of the site for which planning permission has been granted has been entered into, and evidence of that contract submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the demolition is followed by immediate rebuilding and to safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

8. Preservation of features

Architectural features shall be removed under the supervision of a specialist contractor approved by the local planning authority and stored in a suitable place to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Suitable precautions must be taken to secure and protect architectural features against accidental loss or damage during the building work.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed building.

Prior to Commencement of Development Conditions

9. Written Scheme of Investigation

No demolition or development shall take place until a written scheme of investigation (WSI) has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land and historic buildings that are included within the WSI, no demolition or development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include the statement of significance, conservation, interpretation and research objectives, and:

The programme and methodology of site archaeological investigation and building recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works
The programme and methodology for a community archaeology and history project
The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. this part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: In order to ensure that all historic environment investigation and recording is appropriately controlled.

Informative: The written scheme of investigation will need to be prepared and implemented by a suitably professionally accredited archaeological practice in accordance with Historic England’s Guidelines for Archaeological Projects in Greater London. This condition is exempt from deemed discharge under schedule 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

10. Submission of further details

a) Sustainable Drainage Strategy

Notwithstanding the details set out in the submitted Preliminary Drainage Strategy (February 2017) and Drawing 1441/028 Rev B, prior to the commencement of any construction work (excluding demolition and site investigation works), details of the Sustainable Drainage Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and must conform with the Landscaping Strategy. The details shall include:

i) Sizes, storage volumes, cross-sections, long-sections (where appropriate) and locations and specifications of all the source control SuDS measures including rain gardens, raised planters, green roofs, swales and permeable paving

ii) Final sizes, storage volumes, invert levels, cross-sections and specifications of all site control SuDS measures i.e. eastern and western ponds including any control mechanisms that may restrict flows to the receiving reservoir.

b) Detailed Design and Materials

Detailed drawings to a scale of 1:20 or larger to confirm the detailed design and materials of the proposed replacement and new internal and external architectural features to the Mansion House, West Wing, Orangery, Undercroft car park and refuse store, including:

a) Windows at a scale of 1:10 (including cills, reveals, heads, window furniture);

b) Doors (including jambs, architraves, door case, door furniture);

c) Roof (eaves and parapet detail);

d) New extensions to Orangery and Mansion House (including mullion sections/ junctions/ how the structure will be affixed to the listed building);

e) New entrance portico to the Mansion House;

f) Detail and location of rain water pipes to all elevations;

g) Details and proposed location of cast iron grilles to all elevations;

h) Details of flue extracts at roof level to Mansion House and Orangery;

i) Internal elevations of The Orangery;

k) Details of the living trellis wall to the proposed Orangery extension;
Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development under each phase hereby permitted. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

**Prior to Above Ground Development Condition**

11. **Material Samples**

Prior to commencement of each phase of development above ground (excluding demolition and site investigation works) hereby approved, samples of all the types of external materials and finishes to be used in the proposed development (including windows, roof finish, replacement architectural features, brick type, face bond, pointing, render and paintwork), and a schedule of materials to be used in all external and internal elevations including walls (including brick bonding and pointing samples), doors, windows, front entrances and balconies within the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each phase of the development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.

Materials shall be provided for each phase of the development including:

a. The demolition of extensions to the Mansion House and its restoration; conversion and extension (to include its terrace and forecourt);

b. The Orangery demolition of extension to Orangery and restoration conversion and extension to include swimming pool;

c. Restoration of Wisteria Walk and the Registered Park;

d. Site-wide sustainable drainage system (SUD's) incorporated into the historic landscape;

e. Repair and/or reinstatement of listed structures across the site, including decorative statues and gate piers.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

12. **Method Statement**

Prior to the commencement of works, a full method statement and detailed schedule for the conservation, repair and replacement of all internal and external architectural features of the Mansion House and Terrace, Orangery, Wisteria Walk and associated statuary and landscape features is to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the method statement and schedule.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the completed development respects the special character and appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

13. **External vents and flues**
Details regarding any new external vents or flues shall be submitted to and approved in writing by
the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. Such details shall include details of their design,
materials and siting.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and
appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

14. New and relocated services/fittings

The position, type and manner of installation of all services and related fittings shall be
adequately specified in advance of any work being carried out, and the prior approval of the
Local Planning Authority must be obtained wherever these installations are to be visible or where
ducts or other methods of concealment are proposed.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and
appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.

15. Plumbing

No plumbing or pipes shall be fixed on the external faces of the building unless shown on the
approved drawings.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and safeguard the character and
appearance of the Grade II listed buildings and structures.
TRENT PARK HOUSE

Section 1.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: TRENT PARK HOUSE
List entry Number: 1078931

Section 1.02 Location
TRENT PARK HOUSE, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: 10-Dec-1975

Section 1.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200528

Section 1.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 1.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
BRAMLEY N14 (North Side) (off)
shall be amended to read COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side)
1. 4411 BRAMLEY ROAD N14 (North Side) (Off) Trent Park House TQ 29 NE 19/20
II

2. Circa 1895 house in early Georgian style, very large scale. Recased in 1926 by Charles Holden for Sir Philip Sassoon, the purchaser. The house may contain part of an earlier C19 building on the site but nothing is visible. Entrance front of 3 storeys and basement, 13 windows. Centre and ends project. Red brick with stone quoins, bands, window architraves and balustraded parapet. Sash windows with glazing bars. Central doorcase has Corinthian entablature with serpentine open pediment. Balustrades to basement areas. Between each outer pair of ground floor winders a classical statue on plinth. Similar north front with stone urns crowning low wall; and a classical figure group on plinth at west end. Inside, along the north front a handsome suite of inter-connecting reception rooms with classical detail. Some panels of Chinese wall-paper mounted in control room; and painted decoration said to be by Rex Whistler in the end rooms. Also a fine entrance hall and staircase. Sir Philip Sassoon entertained the Prince of Wales (later Edward VIII) and Sir Winston Churchill at this house.

Listing NGR: TQ2909097350

(e) **Selected Sources**
Other

---

**Article II.  TRENT PARK**

**Section 2.01 List Entry Summary**

This garden or other land is registered under the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 within the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens by English Heritage for its special historic interest.

Name: TRENT PARK  
List entry Number: 1000484

**Section 2.02 Location**

The garden or other land may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County: Greater London Authority  
District: Enfield  
District Type: London Borough  
Parish:  
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.  
Grade: II  
Date first registered: 01-Oct-1987  
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

**Section 2.03 Legacy System Information**

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.  
Legacy System: Parks and Gardens  
UID: 1457
Section 2.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 2.05 List entry Description

(a) **Summary of Garden**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) **Reasons for Designation**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) **History**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) **Details**
Late C18 landscape park, lakes and woodland, developed throughout the C19, and further developed early C20 by Sir Philip Sassoon with advice from Norah Lindsay.

HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT

In 1777 George III gave his consent to an Act of Parliament to divide, enclose and disafforest the royal hunting forest of Enfield Chase. The ancient forest had been poached to such an extent during the C18 that it no longer made a profit. The fringes of the Chase were assigned to neighbouring parishes and farms and the remaining area was divided into lots and leased as farmland. The Act also provided that the deer should have the protection of the ancient park laws and lots 21 and 22 were therefore earmarked as a miniature hunting park. The lease of this principal portion of Crown land was granted in c 1780 to Dr Richard Jebb, the physician to George III. The property and a knighthood (in 1778) were given to Jebb as a reward for saving the life of the King’s brother, the Duke of Gloucester, at Trento in the Austrian Tyrol. The land included one of the old Chase lodges, which Sir William Chambers converted into a miniature villa, known as Trent Place. A deer park of 200 acres (c 83ha) and a lake were laid out in the late C18.

Sir Richard Jebb died in 1787 and the estate was purchased by the Earl of Cholmondeley, who sold it to John Wigston of Edmonton in 1793. It was probably Wigston who enlarged the house with the addition of wings and was also said to have spent lavishly on the estate. In 1810 Wigston sold the property to Sir Henry Lushington, who went bankrupt and sold it on to John Cumming in 1813. Cumming was said to have spent £20,000 on repairs and improvements to the house and grounds (Robinson 1823).

In 1833 the estate was purchased by David Bevan, a partner in Barclays Bank. Bevan passed the estate on to his eldest son, Robert Cooper Lee Bevan, in 1837. Robert Bevan resided at Trent for fifty-three years and was responsible for many improvements to the property, which he re-named Trent Park. By the mid C19 the park was 700 acres (c 291ha) in extent and the whole estate was 3000 acres (1250ha), with a seven-mile ride around the perimeter (Keane 1850). In 1890, Robert Bevan died and was succeeded by his son, Francis. Francis Bevan applied to the Duchy of Lancaster in 1893 for a building grant to reconstruct the house.

Bevan sold the estate in 1909 to Sir Edward Sassoon, a merchant banker and MP for Hythe. Sir Edward died in 1912 and his eldest son, Sir Philip Sassoon succeeded. Sassoon rebuilt parts of the house and laid out new gardens.

Sir Philip Sassoon died in 1939 and the house was requisitioned as an officers' prisoner of war camp and interrogation centre for enemy airmen (the Combined Services Detailed Interrogation
From 1947 the mansion with c 81ha of land became the Trent Park Training College, a teacher training college. In 1974 this became the Middlesex Polytechnic and from 1992, Middlesex University. In 1951 the entire estate was compulsorily purchased by Middlesex County Council (subject to the life tenancy of Hannah Gubbay, Sassoon's cousin) as Green Belt land. In 1965 the Greater London Council took over the administration of the park and the London Borough of Enfield took over the college. Hannah Gubbay died in 1968 and most of the land was adapted for use by the public as Trent Country Park, officially opened to the public in 1973. The London Borough of Enfield took over the responsibility of managing Trent Country Park in April 1986, following the demise of the GLC.

DESCRIPTION

LOCATION, AREA, BOUNDARIES, LANDFORM, SETTING Trent Park, c 320ha, is located to the north-east of Cockfosters, in the London Borough of Enfield. The Park is bounded by Hadley Road to the north, Cockfosters Road (A111) to the west, open farmland to the north-west and east, and Trent Park Public Golf Course, open farmland and small woods to the south. A valley runs west/east through the centre of the site and the ground falls from west to east. There are good views from the higher ground, and from the terrace to the north of the house, over the lakes and park. The boundaries are mostly marked by wooden fences.

ENTRANCES AND APPROACHES The approach to Trent Park house is from Cockfosters Road to the west (1km south-west of the house), through the late C19 west entrance gateway (listed grade II), with semicircular red-brick and stone quadrant walls, with returned ends, flanking two large piers, with finials of urns and garlands, supporting panelled wood gates. On either side of the entrance are seven stone bollards with ogee domed tops (listed grade II). The entrance masks the half-timbered Victorian lodge. The drive curves north-east through the park and then from the southern end of Oak Wood leads east through an avenue of lime trees (planted in the 1840s). There are early C18 monuments originally from Wrest Park, Bedfordshire (qv) at either end of the avenue, bought to Trent Park by Sir Philip Sassoon in 1934. That to the west (listed grade II) is a tall stone column with a pineapple finial (inscribed 'To the memory of Jemima Crewe, Duchess of Kent'), and that to the east (listed grade II) is a short stone obelisk with a melon finial (inscribed 'To the memory of Henry, Duke of Kent'). The drive then passes a small inner lodge to the south, enters a wood known as The Rookery and then branches, the northern branch leading to the entrance (south) front of the house. The southern branch leads to the stable courtyard (120m south of the house). An alternative approach to the house (no longer in use) was from Bramley Road (A110) to the south, up Snakes Lane, with a small lodge at Bramley Road and another small lodge at the south side of The Rookery.

The west entrance is also the main entrance to the country park, the drive dividing at the first monument and leading north into Oak Wood, to a cafe and a car park. There is a further vehicular entrance to the country park from Hadley Road to the north, with a car park in Moat Wood. From Moat Wood a drive (no longer used) leads south down Camlet Hill and between the lakes and around the west side of the gardens, to join the west approach. A pedestrian entrance from Hadley Road, at the western edge of Moat Wood, leads directly to Camlet Moat (see below).

PRINCIPAL BUILDING The present house, Trent Park (listed grade II), was largely rebuilt between 1894 and 1931. The original villa on the site was one of the Enfield Chase lodges and was altered and enlarged by Sir William Chambers for Sir Richard Jebb, in c 1777. This was extended to the east, west and south during the late C18 or early C19, and again in the mid C19. Francis Bevan rebuilt much of the house, including the south front. Sir Philip Sassoon rebuilt the east and north fronts, changed the windows, and refaced the whole house in C18 bricks from William Kent's demolished Devonshire House. Between 1926 and 1931 the Victorian additions
were demolished or altered, except for the west service wing, and projecting wings were added to the entrance (south) front. The work was carried out by Philip Tilden for Sir Philip Sassoon and the result was a large, early Georgian-style mansion.

GARDENS AND PLEASURE GROUNDS On approaching the house, the entrance drive leads past a pair of stone gate piers, supporting urns (c 1700, listed grade II), c 25m south-west of the house. To the south of the house is a large forecourt, laid out in a pattern of setts and paving stones and marked off by bollards from an area of tarmac to the west, used as staff car parking. To either side of the main entrance to the house are lead figures, to the left (west) Actaeon (listed grade II) and to the right (east) Venus (listed grade II). Both date from c 1700 and were brought here in the 1930s from Wrest Park.

To the south of the forecourt are lawns with scattered mature trees and naturalised daffodils, planted by Sassoon in the 1920s. To the south-east of the house is the stable courtyard, three sides composed of gabled gothic buildings and the fourth with polychrome brick arches. To the south and south-west of the stables are the kitchen gardens and several estate cottages, built by R Bevan between 1837 and 1890. Grouped around the stables and the cottages is a range of 1960s-70s buildings.

Running along the east side of the kitchen gardens and extending northwards on line with the house, are formal gardens, laid out in the 1910s in three parts. The southernmost part, to the east of the kitchen garden, is the Wistaria Walk laid out in the 1910s for Sir Philip Sassoon. It consists of a pergola (listed grade II), with columns of Italian pink marble, entwined with massive wistarias, supporting a wooden structure. The pergola is orientated north/south and is paved with stone slabs. The Walk is bordered to the east by a hedge and to the west by the kitchen garden wall. The southern end leads into the kitchen garden through an C18 cast- and wrought-iron gate (listed grade II) set in gate piers of c 1915, which are set in the kitchen garden wall. To the north of the Wistaria Walk the gardens continue as three pairs of beds forming long borders, planted with herbaceous plants, enclosed by yew hedges. To the north of the borders are four 'rooms', two on each side of the central walk, walled with yew hedges. The 'rooms' contain rectangular lily ponds, each set in lawn and surrounded by a border of roses. Originally the formal gardens continued further to the north and had views from a rondpoint, on which some of the statue groups and the water gardens were aligned along an avenue of limes. These views were destroyed when the two buildings (the new library and hall) which now terminate the north end of the gardens were built in the 1970s.

To the north of the house is a long, raised, early C20 terrace with balustrading around the edge and flights of steps on either side. At the top of the steps to the east is a pair of lead sphinxes by Nost (c 1700, listed grade II), brought from Stowe (qv). At the west end of the terrace there is an early C18 marble group of two female figures and a winged male figure (listed grade II, from Stowe or Milton Abbey). There are extensive views from the terrace: overlooking the lawn down to the lakes and park to the north; to the water gardens to the north-east; and up to a stone obelisk (see below) on the north-west boundary of the park, seen through a ride cut through Moat Wood. The terrace continues around the east side of the house and overlooks a rectangular early C20 swimming pool at a lower level. The pool is set in a lawn and bordered on the west side by the terrace wall, to the north and south by beech hedges and to the east by an early C20 red-brick orangery by Reginald Cooper (listed grade II together with terrace and sphinxes). The orangery is angled and has brick walls to either side enclosing a small terrace, four steps higher than the level of the swimming pool. Its parapet supports three urns flanked by cherubs. The low walls to either side of the steps are terminated with stone piers, decorated with Coade stone roundels and supporting Coade stone sphinxes (dated 1787). The Music Centre (1973) was built on to the back (east side) of the orangery and is adjacent to the formal gardens.

On lawns below the terrace there are two lead groups from Stowe, both by Nost after Giovanni de
Bologna: Hercules wrestling Antaeus (listed grade II), c 20m to the north-east of the terrace, and against the west wall of the new library; and Samson defeating the Philistine (listed grade II), c 12m north-west of the terrace and surrounded by large cedars of Lebanon. Around the west end of the house area stands a group of 1960s-70s buildings, including a teaching block, hall/theatre, gymnasium, tutorial rooms and science labs.

The lawns to the north of the terrace run down to the lake edge and continue around to the west of the house, where they merge into the mid C19 pleasure grounds, with scattered mature trees and some remaining shrub groups. On the eastern edge of the pleasure grounds is an C18 stone urn on a pedestal (c 120m north-west of the house, listed grade II). A track leads north through the pleasure grounds to the pair of linked lakes, which run west/east for 600m, the larger lake being c 200m north of the house. At the eastern end of the larger (eastern) lake are the early C20 water gardens in Icehouse Wood, with groups of azaleas, maples, magnolias and eucalyptus trees. A pair of small bridges connect the north and south lake edges. Sassoon kept a collection of exotic birds and waterfowl, including flamingos, pelicans and king penguins on the lake (now gone).

PARK To the east, north and west of the lakes is open parkland, with scattered mature trees (mostly mid C19 oak trees but with some trees remaining from the C18 and earlier). The park to the north of the lake island was laid out as a golf course in the early C20 (removed mid C20) and some of the mounds can be seen in the ground. Around the eastern and northern edges of the park are woods: Williams Wood to the east, Ride Wood to the north-east, Moat Wood to the north, and Rough Lot to the north-west. A circuit drive connects the woods and there are further walks through the woods, which have mixed planting, mostly oak, beech, birch and holly. Between Rough Lot and Oak Wood the park continues to the west up to the boundary by Ferny Hill Wood. A long narrow wood known as Seedfield Spinney runs along the course of the water supply for the lakes. A narrow boundary plantation wraps around the north-west, west and south-west boundaries. On the north-west edge of Moat Wood is the early C18 obelisk (c 900m north-west of the house, brought to Trent Park from Wrest Park in the 1930s, listed grade II), which is seen from the house terrace. Near the north boundary of the Moat Wood is Camlet Moat (scheduled ancient monument), a substantial moated site with traces of buildings, said to be the manor house of the Mandevilles, earls of Essex, and a haunt of Dick Turpin (Robinson 1823).

KITCHEN GARDEN The kitchen garden is located 150m to the south of the house and 50m to the south of the stable courtyard. It has C18 red-brick walls on each side and rows of old apple trees along some of the paths.

REFERENCES


Description written: December 1998 Register Inspector: CB Edited: May 2000

(e) Selected Sources

Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details

National Grid Reference: TQ 28735 97589
Article III. FRONT LODGE AT TRENT PARK

Section 3.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: FRONT LODGE AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1387178

Section 3.02 Location
FRONT LODGE AT TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 05-May-1999
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 3.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 475093

Section 3.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 3.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
TQ 29 NE COCKFOSTERS ROAD (Northeast, off) Front Lodge at Trent Park 790/19/10044
GV II

West lodge to Trent Park. 1898 by John T. Lee for Francis Bevan. Red brick with flint panels and timber-framed upper floor with pebbledashed infill; machine tile roofs. Tudor Revival style. Irregular plan. EXTERIOR: composition is of gables to all directions. 2 storeys. Entrance in south gable end: half-glazed door over 2 panels set behind screen of 4 turned balusters with 4-centred heads supporting projecting upper floor. Scrolled brackets right and left. Timber-framed upper floor lit through canted oriel fitted with multi-paned casements and supporting projecting gable head. Plain bargeboards throughout. East front with an open verandah consisting of 4 turned balusters to south with 4-centred heads on high brick plinth; similar opening to south return of verandah. Main south elevation with 3 single-light casements to ground floor and a timber-framed first floor resting on moulded brick and timber string course which continues round entire building. Gable head to centre with one 2-light casement. North return with similar gable-head details and a plain doorway to ground floor opening into small enclosed scullery yard with plank door into house. West return with a canted bay window fitted with multi-paned casements and set within sandstone surround to ground floor, and one 2-light casement to left. First-floor is a mirror image of east front. Prominent central ridge stack with ornamented quadruple star-topped flues decorated with spiral, fleuron, thistle and diaper motifs of moulded brick, all set on a square moulded plinth. Octagonal single-flued stack on east wall plane: moulded plinth, raised lozenge patterning to shaft of moulded brick and one star top. INTERIOR: 4-panelled doors. Closed string open-well staircase with square balusters and newels and moulded handrails.
Article IV. BOLLARDS AT ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK

Section 4.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: BOLLARDS AT ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1188928

Section 4.02 Location

BOLLARDS AT ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 4.03 Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200606

Section 4.04 Asset Groupings

This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 4.05 List Entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
1. 4411 COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side) Bollards at entrance gateway to Trent Park TQ 29 NE 19/119
2. At either side of gateway 7 battered stone bollards with chamfered angles and ogee domed tops.

Listing NGR: TQ2795696671

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 27956 96671

Article V. WEST ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK

Section 5.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: WEST ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1358676

Section 5.02 Location
WEST ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTER'S ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 5.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200605

Section 5.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 5.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.
(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
1. 4411 COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side) West entrance gateway to Trent Park

TQ 29 NE 19/118

II

2. Late C19. Wide quadrant walls of red brick stone plinth and entablature and returned ends. At each side 5 square piers, rusticated with stone bands and having stone caps and ball finials above entablatures, at intervals. Wall panelled between piers. At centre walls finished by 2 larger piers, with finials of urns and garlands, holding large, panelled wood gates.

Listing NGR: TQ2796196672

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 27961 96672

Article VI. STATUE ON NORTH WEST END OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK

Section 6.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: STATUE ON NORTH WEST END OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1240982

Section 6.02 Location
STATUE ON NORTH WEST END OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 6.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200841
Section 6.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 6.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/129 Statue on north west end of terrace at Trent Park

II GV

Statue. Early C18, French school; brought mid 1920s to Trent Park from Stowe, Bucks or Milton Abbey, Dorset, by Sir Philip Sassoon. Marble statue on ashlar plinth. Rectangular plinth with moulded base and cornice supports statue which depicts 'Time and Opportunity' or 'Peace embracing Time', comprising female figure reclining against lion and looking up at standing winged male figure who holds aloft a female figure. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2906397368

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29063 97368

Article VII. SCULPTURES TO NORTH EAST AND NORTH WEST OF TERRACE OF TRENT PARK

Section 7.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: SCULPTURES TO NORTH EAST AND NORTH WEST OF TERRACE OF TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1358983

Section 7.02 Location
SCULPTURES TO NORTH EAST AND NORTH WEST OF TERRACE OF TRENT PARK, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: 10-Dec-1975

**Section 7.03 Legacy System Information**
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200529

**Section 7.04 Asset Groupings**
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

**Section 7.05 List entry Description**

(a) **Summary of Building**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) **Reasons for Designation**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) **History**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) **Details**
BRAMLEY N14 (North Side) (off) shall be amended to read COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side)
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- 1. 4411 BRAMLEY ROAD N14 (North Side) (Off)
Sculptures to north-east and north-west of terrace of Trent Park TQ 29 NE 19/21

II

2. Two stone classical groups, C18 copies of antique sculptures mounted on plinths. Possibly brought from Wrest Park in Bedfordshire.

Listing NGR: TQ2905597378

(e) **Selected Sources**
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29055 97378

**Article VIII. OBELISK ON THE WEST SIDE OF MOAT WOOD IN TRENT PARK**

**Section 8.01 List Entry Summary**
This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.
Name: OBELISK ON THE WEST SIDE OF MOAT WOOD IN TRENTPARK
List entry Number: 1358677

Section 8.02 Location
OBELISK ON THE WEST SIDE OF MOAT WOOD IN TRENTPARK, HADLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: 10-Dec-1975

Section 8.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200608

Section 8.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 8.05 List entry Description
(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
1. 4411 HADLEY ROAD (South Side) obelisk on the west side of Moat Wood in Trent Park

TW 29 NE 19/122
II

The map reference TW 29NE 19/122 shall be amended to read TQ 29NE 19/122


The following should be added to the above description "The date of 1702, possibly added when the obelisk was moved to Trent Park, is incorrect. The Earl of Harold was born in 1733 and died in infancy.---------------------------

1. 4411 FERNY HILL (South Side) Obelisk near North-west angle of Trent Park TW 29 NE 19/122
II

2. Very tall obelisk of dressed stones on square plinth. Dated 1702 with inscription: "To the
memory of the birth of George Grey, Earl of Harold, son of Henry and Sophia, Duke and Duchess of Kent." Brought from Wrest Park in Bedfordshire.

FERNY HILL (South Side) Obelisk near North-west angle of Trent Park shall be amended to read

Listing NGR: TQ2855398050

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 28553 98050

Article IX. STATUE APPROXIMATELY 20 METRES NORTH EAST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK

Section 9.01 List Entry Summary
This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: STATUE APPROXIMATELY 20 METRES NORTH EAST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1079463

Section 9.02 Location
STATUE APPROXIMATELY 20 METRES NORTH EAST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 9.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200847

Section 9.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.
Section 9.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/131 Statue approx 20 metres north-east corner of terrace at Trent Park (formerly listed under 'sculptures to north-east and north-west of terrace II of Trent Park

GV


Listing NGR: TQ2913797383

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29137 97383

Article X.  STATUE OF ACTAEON TO LEFT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK

Section 10.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: STATUE OF ACTAEON TO LEFT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1079459

Section 10.02 Location
STATUE OF ACTAEON TO LEFT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Bramley Road TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/125 Statue of Actaeon to left of main entrance to Trent Park

II GV

Statue. Circa 1700; in 1934 brought to Trent Park from Wrest Park, Beds by Sir Philip Sassoon. Ashlar plinth; lead statue. Plinth, with moulded base and cornice, has front carved with hunting trophy. Statue depicts Actaeon with restored raised arm, and seated dog behind. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2908297339

Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29082 97339

Article XI. PAIR OF GATEPIERS, APPROXIMATELY 25 METRES TO SOUTH WEST OF MAIN ENTRANCE OF TRENT PARK

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: PAIR OF GATEPIERS, APPROXIMATELY 25 METRES TO SOUTH WEST OF MAIN ENTRANCE OF TRENT PARK

Section 10.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200837

Section 10.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 10.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/125 Statue of ACTAEON to left of main entrance to Trent Park

II GV

Statue. Circa 1700; in 1934 brought to Trent Park from Wrest Park, Beds by Sir Philip Sassoon. Ashlar plinth; lead statue. Plinth, with moulded base and cornice, has front carved with hunting trophy. Statue depicts Actaeon with restored raised arm, and seated dog behind. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2908297339

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29082 97339
Section 11.02 Location
PAIR OF GATEPIERS, APPROXIMATELY 25 METRES TO SOUTH WEST OF MAIN ENTRANCE OF TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 11.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200839

Section 11.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 11.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/127 Pair of gatepiers, approx 25 metres to south west of main entrance of Trent Park

II GV

Pair of gatepiers. Circa 1700, possibly brought to Trent Park by Sir Philip Sassoon 1930s.
Ashlar. Square piers with stepped bases below string and cornices. Each supports urn on stepped pedestal, the urns with swept and gadrooned bases and lids, drapes and finials. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2906497332

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29064 97332
Article XII. PAIR OF SPHINXES FLANKING STEPS ON EAST SIDE OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK

Section 12.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: PAIR OF SPHINXES FLANKING STEPS ON EAST SIDE OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1079461

Section 12.02 Location
PAIR OF SPHINXES FLANKING STEPS ON EAST SIDE OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 12.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200842

Section 12.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 12.05 List entry Description

(a) **Summary of Building**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) **Reasons for Designation**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) **History**
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) **Details**
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/130 Pair of sphinxes flanking steps on east side of terrace at Trent Park

II GV

Pair of sphinxes. Circa 1700 by Nost; mid 1920s brought to Trent Park from Stowe, Bucks, by Sir Philip Sassoon. Lead statues on ashlar plinths. Corniced, stepped, plinths support statues depicting sphinxes with heads turned inwards. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic
interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2912197362

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29121 97362

Article XIII. URN ON PEDESTAL APPROXIMATELY 120 METRES NORTH WEST OF TRENT PARK

Section 13.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: URN ON PEDESTAL APPROXIMATELY 120 METRES NORTH WEST OF TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1358745

Section 13.02 Location
URN ON PEDESTAL APPROXIMATELY 120 METRES NORTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 13.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200840

Section 13.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 13.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.
(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/128 Urn on pedestal approx 120 metres north west of II Trent Park

GV

Urn on pedestal. Early-mid C18, probably brought to Trent Park by Sir Philip Sassoon 1930s. Ashlar. Square pedestal approximately 1 metre high with moulded base and cornice. Urn has swept, decorated foot; gadrooned base; festoons hanging alternately from bows and from lions' mouths; and decorative domed top with finial missing. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2894597371

(e) Selected Sources
Other

Article XIV. GATEPIER WITH GATE AT SOUTH EAST END OF WISTERIA WALK AT TRENT PARK

Section 14.01 List Entry Summary
This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: GATEPIER WITH GATE AT SOUTH EAST END OF WISTERIA WALK AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1079462

Section 14.02 Location
GATEPIER WITH GATE AT SOUTH EAST END OF WISTERIA WALK AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 14.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200845
Section 14.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 14.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/134 Gatepi er with gate at south east end of Wisteria Walk at Trent Park

II GV

Gatepiers and gate. C18 gate on piers of c.1915. Gate of cast and wrought iron hung from brick-piers which have flat capstones surmounted by flower-like stone urns. The gate has 2 tall leafs with finiallyed, shaped top, and delicate decorative scrollwork incorporating spearheaded finials and central circles. The gate is likely to have been brought to Trent Park from elsewhere for Sir Philip Sassoon, as is the case with other garden items (qv). Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2925097174

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29250 97174

Article XV. STATUE APPROXIMATELY 12 METRES NORTH WEST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK

Section 15.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: STATUE APPROXIMATELY 12 METRES NORTH WEST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1241066

Section 15.02 Location
STATUE APPROXIMATELY 12 METRES NORTH WEST CORNER OF TERRACE AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 15.03  Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200846

Section 15.04  Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 15.05  List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/21 Statue approx 12 metres north-west corner of terrace at Trent Park (formerly listed under 'sculptures to north-east and north-west of terrace II of Trent Park')


Listing NGR: TQ2905397384

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29053 97384
Article XVI. STATUE OF VENUS TO RIGHT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK

Section 16.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: STATUE OF VENUS TO RIGHT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1260775

Section 16.02 Location

STATUE OF VENUS TO RIGHT OF MAIN ENTRANCE TO TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 16.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200838

Section 16.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 16.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/126 Statue of Venus to right of main entrance to Trent Park

II GV

Statue. Circa 1700 with later head; in 1934 brought to Trent Park from Wrest Park, Beds, by Sir Philip Sassoon. Ashlar plinth, lead statue. Plinth, with moulded base and cornice, has front carved with weapons of the hunt, pair of birds and toiletry items. Statue depicts Venus tying garter of leg raised on pedestal with a cupid at her feet. Register of Parks and Gardens of special
historic interest in England, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2909997337

(e) Selected Sources

Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29099 97337

Article XVII. MONUMENT TO SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE EAST END OF THE AVENUE

Section 17.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: MONUMENT TO SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE EAST END OF THE AVENUE
List entry Number: 1188503

Section 17.02 Location
MONUMENT TO SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE EAST END OF THE AVENUE, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: 10-Dec-1975

Section 17.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200530

Section 17.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 17.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.
BRAMLEY N14 (North Side) (off) shall be amended to read COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side)

Monument to south-west of Trent Park, near the east end of the Avenue. TQ 29 NE 19/22

II

2. Early C18, Tall column, with pineapple finial, on square plinth all of dressed stone. On west sideinscription: "To the memory of Iemima Crewce, Duchess of Kent". On the east side coupled escutcheons with crown over. Brought from Wrest Park in Bedfordshire.

Listing NGR: TQ2886097120

(e) Selected Sources

Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 28860 97120

Article XVIII. MONUMENT TO WEST SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE WEST END OF THE AVENUE

Section 18.01 List Entry Summary

This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: MONUMENT TO WEST SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE WEST END OF THE AVENUE
List entry Number: 1078932

Section 18.02 Location
MONUMENT TO WEST SOUTH WEST OF TRENT PARK, NEAR THE WEST END OF THE AVENUE, COCKFOSTERS ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 31-Jan-1974
Date of most recent amendment: 10-Dec-1975

Section 18.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200531

Section 18.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.
Section 18.05 List entry Description

(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
BRAMLEY N14 (North Side) (off) shall be amended to read COCKFOSTERS ROAD (East Side)

1. 4411 BRAMLEY ROAD N14 (North Side) (off) Monument to west-south-west of Trent Park, near the west end of the Avenue TQ 29 NE 19/23

II


Listing NGR: TQ2808196891

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 28081 96891

Article XIX. PERGOLA, KNOWN AS WISTERIA WALK TO SOUTH EAST OF FORMER STABLE BLOCK AT TRENT PARK

Section 19.01 List Entry Summary
This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: PERGOLA, KNOWN AS WISTERIA WALK TO SOUTH EAST OF FORMER STABLE BLOCK AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1358746

Section 19.02 Location
PERGOLA, KNOWN AS WISTERIA WALK TO SOUTH EAST OF FORMER STABLE BLOCK AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish:
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 19.03  Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200844

Section 19.04  Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 19.05  List entry Description
(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
The following building shall be added to the list:

BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/133 Pergola, known as Wisteria Walk to south east of former stable block at Trent Park

II GV

Pergola. Probably 1913-15, reusing medieval columns; for Sir Philip Sassoon. Italian pink marble columns linked by timber beams supporting timber framework. 10 bays leading to exedra at south end, and with 4 columns across north end. The columns have a variety of capitals; 6 bays of columns blown down and lying on ground at time of inspection (23.5.90). Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest, Part 17, Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2924497198

(e) Selected Sources
Other
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29244 97198

Article XX. ORANGERY WITH FRONT TERRACE AND WALL WITH SPHINXES AT TRENT PARK

Section 20.01  List Entry Summary
This building is listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest.

Name: ORANGERY WITH FRONT TERRACE AND WALL WITH SPHINXES AT TRENT PARK
List entry Number: 1260709

Section 20.02 Location
ORANGERY WITH FRONT TERRACE AND WALL WITH SPHINXES AT TRENT PARK, BRAMLEY ROAD
The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: 
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: II
Date first listed: 17-Oct-1990
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 20.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: LBS
UID: 200843

Section 20.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 20.05 List entry Description
(a) Summary of Building
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(c) History
Legacy Record - This information may be included in the List Entry Details.

(d) Details
BRAMLEY ROAD TQ 29 NE (north side, off) 19/132 Orangery with front terrace and wall with sphinxes at Trent Park

II GV

Orangery, now part of music school. Circa 1930 by Col R Cooper for Sir Philip Sassoon, incorporating early C18 sculpture from Wrest Park, Beds. Red brick in Flemish bond with stone dressings and sculpture; sphinxes of Coade stone; flat roof concealed by parapet. One storey. 5 bays, the end bays canted. Each bay, and the returned end bays, has a round-arched small-pane French window below fanlight with radial glazing bars. Band below coped parapet which supports 3 sculptures (at centre and ends) each comprising a garlanded urn flanked by cherubs. In front of Orangery is terrace approached up 4 shallow steps to each side of which are low brick walls which return to the orangery as quadrants; next to the steps they terminate in plinths which have Coade stone roundels of the seasons and support sphinxes, one of which is dated 1787. Late C20 music school addition to rear of orangery is not of special interest. Orangery listed principally because of interest of the C18 sculptures. Register of Parks and Gardens of special historic interest in England, Part 17; Greater London.

Listing NGR: TQ2918797341
Selected Sources
Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, Part 17 Greater London
National Grid Reference: TQ 29187 97341

Article XXI. Moated site, Camlet Moat, Moat Wood

Section 21.01 List Entry Summary
This monument is scheduled under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 as amended as it appears to the Secretary of State to be of national importance. This entry is a copy, the original is held by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Name: Moated site, Camlet Moat, Moat Wood
List entry Number: 1005551

Section 21.02 Location
The monument may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.
County: Greater London Authority
District: Enfield
District Type: London Borough
Parish: Non Civil Parish
National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.
Grade: Not applicable to this List entry.
Date first scheduled: 22-Mar-1949
Date of most recent amendment: Not applicable to this List entry.

Section 21.03 Legacy System Information
The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.
Legacy System: RSM - OCN
UID: LO 74

Section 21.04 Asset Groupings
This list entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

Section 21.05 List entry Description
(a) Summary of Monument
Camlet Moat, 274m south-west of Parkside House.

(b) Reasons for Designation
Around 6,000 moated sites are known in England. They consist of wide ditches, often or seasonally water-filled, partly or completely enclosing one or more islands of dry ground on which stood domestic or religious buildings. In some cases the islands were used for horticulture. The majority of moated sites served as prestigious aristocratic and seigneurial residences with the provision of a moat intended as a status symbol rather than a practical military defence. The peak period during which moated sites were built was between about 1250 and 1350 and by far the greatest concentration lies in central and eastern parts of England. However, moated sites were built throughout the medieval period, are widely scattered throughout England and exhibit a high level of diversity in their forms and sizes. They form a significant class of medieval monument and are important for the understanding of the distribution of wealth and status in the
The monument includes a medieval moated site, traditionally known as Camlet Moat, surviving as a water-filled earthwork and archaeological remains. It is situated on a south-east facing slope near the summit of Ferny Hill, within the bounds of Trent Country Park at Enfield Chase. The moat is quadrangular in shape and orientated NNE to SSW. The island or platform is about 69m long by 53m wide with rounded corners. It stands up to about 2m above the level of the water in the moat. The moat is on average about 10m wide but varies from 5m wide at the narrowest point on the western side to 15m wide at the corners. On the eastern side is a causeway giving access to the island.

Documentary sources provide evidence that the site was the location of a manor house or hunting lodge. Enfield Chase was a medieval royal hunting forest, which became a landscaped park in the late 18th century. In 1440, a house called ‘the manor of Camelot’ was apparently demolished and the materials used to pay for repairs to Hertford Castle. In 1773, the site is described as ‘the ruins and rubbish of an ancient house’. Later sources also refer to a well situated in the north-east corner and evidence for wooden beams or foundations. The site is marked as ‘Camlet Moat’ on OS Maps of 1866, 1896, 1913 and 1935 (1:2500). Partial excavation was carried out on the site in 1923. Surface finds in the late 20th century included roof tiles, a 14th century green glazed floor tile and a piece of timber dated to 1357. In 2003, an archaeological watching brief carried out during the erection of a new fence revealed no significant finds.

Camlet Moat is within the bounds of Trent Park, a Grade II registered Historic Park and Garden.

(e) Selected Sources
Other
NMR TQ29NE3. PastScape 401547.
National Grid Reference: TQ2881098180
LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 18 July 2017

Report of
Assistant Director,
Regeneration & Planning

Contact Officer:
Andy Higham
Sharon Davidson
Liz Sullivan
Tel No: 0208 379 4391

Ward:
Jubilee

Ref: 16/00272/RE4

Category: LBE - Dev by LA

LOCATION: Turin Road Public Open Space, Turin Road, London, N9 8BT

PROPOSAL: Construction of Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) with associated fencing, landscaping and natural play improvements. (Outline application - appearance, landscaping, layout and scale)

Applicant Name & Address:
Danny Hammond
Enfield Council
B Block North
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
EN1 3XD

Agent Name & Address:
Enfield Council
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
London
EN1 3XA

RECOMMENDATION:
That planning permission be APPROVED subject to conditions.
1. Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application site is located at the south eastern end of Turin Road Open Space. The area is designated as Local Open Space.

1.2 The site is abutted by residential properties to the north and west and by Bowes Edmonton Primary School and Nightingale Academy to the south and east.

1.3 The open space is largely unkempt grassland whilst the area where the MUGA is proposed has previously been tarmacked and is utilised by the adjacent school.

2. Proposal

2.1 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the construction of Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) consisting of 3 pitches with associated fencing and landscaping improvements. The existing temporary hardsurfaced area is approximately 1800sqm while the proposed area to be enclosed as 3 pitches is approximately 1970sqm.

3. Relevant Planning History

3.1 LBE/08/0025 - Granted 19th December 2008
Change of use of public open space to provide a temporary play ground to south of school building involving new chain link security fencing, hard surfacing and security gates (previously approved under LBE/07/0005).

3.2 LBE/07/0005 - Granted 29th June 2007
Change of use of public open space to provide a temporary play ground to south of school building involving new chain link security fencing, hard surfacing and security gates.

4. Consultation

4.1 The 21 day public consultation period started on the 1st September 2016 concluding on 22nd September. 95 letters were sent, no responses were received.

4.2 Environmental Health – Concern about hours of use overcome by revisions, discussed below.

5. Relevant Policy

5.1 Development Management Document
DMD68 Noise
DMD69 Light Pollution
DMD 71 Protection and Enhancement of Open Space
DMD 74 Playing Pitches
DMD80 Trees on Development Sites
DMD81 Landscaping

5.2 Core Strategy
CP30 Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment
CP32: Pollution

5.3 London Plan (March 2015) (FALP)
6. Analysis

6.1 The main issues for consideration regarding this application are as follows:

- Principle of the development;
- Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Principle of the Development

6.2 Turin Road Open Space is designated as Local Open Space. Development should not result in the loss of open space unless it is to be re-provided or the space is surplus to requirements.

6.3 The site is open for general public access but is of little value having no facilities for sports and being generally unkempt. The area which is to be enclosed is already hardsurfaced, this was only granted permission on a temporary basis however it has not been returned to public open space and has been utilised by the adjacent school.

6.4 In terms of the principle, the proposed use of open space as sports pitches is considered to be acceptable, supporting and enhancing the use of the currently underutilised open space. The proposed mesh fencing is necessary for practical purposes to secure the facility when it is not in use, it is not however a solid structure and maintains visual openness and no floodlighting is proposed. However the pitches are proposed for the use of the adjacent school, Nightingale Academy, and would be transferred to the school as part of a land swap to facilitate the expansion work already undertaken at Bowes Edmonton Primary School.

6.5 The proposal whilst not significantly changing the visual appearance of the hard surfaced area, notwithstanding the fact that this was only allowed as a temporary situation, would remove the space from public access. It is understood that there is strong justification for this in terms of the provision of educational facilities however this must be balanced against the planning policy which protects local open space.

6.6 Officers are minded that to mitigate the loss of the relevant space which measures approximately 1970sqm, some level of public access must be provided to the facilities. The proposal which is considered acceptable is for one pitch to be available for public use from school closing to 7pm Monday-Friday during term time and from 9am to 7pm Monday-Friday during school holidays. This is considered in terms of neighbouring amenity below. Given that the open space currently provides no formalised sports facilities this is considered to be a suitable gain.

6.7 Officers have discussed in detail the different possibilities for enhancing the remaining open space and it has been determined that the triangular area to the north of the proposed pitches will be planted with 18 various fruit trees and a wildflower meadow to create a community orchard.

Neighbouring amenity
6.8 The site is currently utilised in association with Nightingale Academy and the proposal seeks to formalise this arrangement into 3 pitches and provide one pitch for public use until 7pm on weekdays only.

6.9 The pitch identified for public use is the furthest from residential neighbours who abut the site to the west, at over 20m from the end of the gardens where most neighbours have garages and over 50m from the closest windows. It is important to note that no floodlighting is proposed and just one pitch would be available for public access until 7pm, subject to these circumstances which are recommended as conditions Environmental Health officers are satisfied that the proposal would not result in noise nuisance for neighbouring residents.

6.10 The management of the public access to the northern most pitch and the maintenance will be the responsibility of Nightingale Academy and a condition is recommended that prior to the commencement of the use details be provided of how this will be managed, for example whether via a booking system and details of a sign to communicate this information to the public will also be required.

Fencing

6.11 The final specification of the fencing will be determined by the contractor who is awarded the tender and as such a condition for full elevation details is recommended. However the cross section drawings provide sufficient information to assess the proposed appearance in more general terms.

6.12 The cross section shows that the fencing will have a maximum height of 3.6m with the top 0.6m at a 45 degree crank.

6.13 Given the separation distances with neighbouring residents while the quite prominent fencing will be easily visible it will not have an adverse impact in terms of light or outlook. Furthermore the overall visual amenity value of the open space will also be enhanced by the planting of 18 trees to the north of the pitches.

Flooding

6.14 The proposed surfacing material is open asphalt which is porous, therefore whilst the area of hardsurfacing would increase slightly the proposal will not result in an increase in surface water runoff and should in fact improve the existing situation.

Transport

6.15 It is anticipated that the main users of the public access pitch would be local and would therefore be on foot and no notable impact of the proposed would be seen in terms of demand for parking. However should visitors come by car as only one pitch would be available the number of users at any one time would be very limited.

6.16 The proposal also includes the addition of 3 parking spaces within Nightingale Academy, the spaces are at the northeastern end of the existing and proposed hardsurfaced area. They are a minor continuation of the existing arrangement and are located appropriately and safely within the car park, softlandscaping is proposed around the edge as a buffer and it is considered that there would be no visual or other material impact from this element of the proposal.

7. Conclusion
7.1 Having considered the proposal against the policies applicable to local open space officers are satisfied that the proposal supports and enhances that existing use of the open space and delivers a community benefit. It does not unacceptably impact on the character or use of the open space.

7.2 On the basis of the information provided officers recommend, on balance, that approval be granted.

8. **Recommendation**

8.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to conditions:

**Conditions**

1. **Time Limit**

   The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the decision notice.

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of S.51 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. **Approved Plans**

   The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   **Ordnance Survey**
   
   2015/203/100/0005 Typical cross sections
   2015/203/100/0005 Sports line markings
   2015_203_100_0006

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **Hours of use**

   The pitches shall not be used outside the hours of 09:00 to 19:00 Monday – Friday and at no other time. The northern most pitch only shall be available for public use outside of school hours but within the above limitations and shall be closed at all other times.

   Reason: In the interest of neighbouring residential amenity.

4. **Flooding**

   Prior to the commencement of the development the applicant shall submit details to demonstrate that the hardstanding areas will be sustainably drained and will not result in any increase in runoff.

   Reason: In the interest of sustainable drainage.

5. **Management of access to the site**
Prior to the commencement of the use of the facility details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA demonstrating how visitor access to the pitches will be managed. Once approved those details shall be permanently maintained.

Reason: In the interest of security and amenity of neighbouring residents.

6. Landscaping and maintenance

The site shall be landscaped in accordance with the details hereby approved on drawing no. 2015_203_100_0006 in the first planting season after completion of the development. The trees shall be maintained in accordance with the LB Enfield Corporate Tree Maintenance Strategy. Any trees or shrubs which die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with new planting in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To deliver a community benefit and enhancement to the retained open space.

7. Fencing

Prior to the erection of the fencing full elevation drawings of the proposed fence and detailed drawings/brochure detail showing the specific material and colour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. The fencing shall be constructed in accordance with the agreed detail.

Reason: In the interest of the character and appearance of the open space.
1. Do not issue from the original.

2. Upon instruction to be submitted to the Enfield Council's authority.

3. All drawings and specifications will be submitted to Enfield Council for approval.

4. The drawings are subject to change without notice.

5. Unless otherwise indicated, all materials are to be supplied by the Enfield Council.
Nightingale Academy

Basketball Court - 28.000m x 15.000m
Netball Courts - 30.500m x 15.250m
Tennis Court - 23.770m x 10.970m
5 a Side Football

FOR TENDER
Redevelopment & Environmental Works

NOTES

1. DO NOT SCALE FROM THIS DRAWING.
2. ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ENGINEER'S ATTENTION IMMEDIATELY.
3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE IN METRES UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN.
4. ALL LEVELS ARE IN METRES AND RELATE TO ORDNANCE DATUM LEVEL UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
5. THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL OTHER DRAWINGS IN THE SAME SERIES.
PLANNING CONDITION PROPOSAL NOTES:

Existing northern section of Turin Road open space to become a new community orchard with low maintenance wildflower meadow. Remaining area of Turin Road Open Space to be improved in terms of litter and grounds maintenance before handing over to Parks Team. Trees are to be managed and maintained in line with the London Borough of Enfield Corporate Tree Maintenance Strategy.

1 no. court (most northerly) to be provided to and open for public use from school closing until 7pm during term time, and from 9am to 7pm out of term times.

Community Orchard to be comprised of 18no. trees, varieties to include Plum, Cherry, Pear and Apple of medium to large size 18/20, planted in rotivated and improved soil, with nitrogen fixings to allow for quick establishment.

Pedestrian Gates: They are to be 2.000m high x 1.200m wide and to CLO Lockmaster Swing gate specification or greater.

Maintenance Gates: In the 3.600m high fence, they will be 3.000m high x 3.000m wide and to CLO Lockmaster Swing gate specification or greater. In the 1.200m high fence, they will be 1.200m high x 3.000m wide and to CLO Lockmaster Swing gate specification or greater.

MUGA NOTES

Fencing: The MUGA is to be enclosed with a 385 Mesh Panel fencing system or similar, and shall be 3.000m high fence with a 600mm crank top at 45 degrees that will give an overall height of 3.600m. The MUGA is to be split into 3 courts. 1 court will be enclosed using the same perimeter fence, the other two courts will be separated by a 1.200m high fence. MUGA fencing panels are to be steel galvanised in accordance with BS729, power coated in accordance with BS6497 to a minimum thickness of 60 microns fastened with sound dampened tamper proof fixings to EN15312. The Colour is to be Green RAL 6005 for all Fencing and Gates.

MUGA NOTES

Porous Construction Details for MUGA:

Porous Asphalt: 150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete base 150mm thick, AC20 dense bin 160/220 binder course 50mm thick, PA6 surf 70/100 25mm thick surface course.

Footpath: 150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete base 150mm thick, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense bin 40/60 binder course 60mm thick, AC6 dense surf 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Additional Car Parking Area: 205 x 150 mm pre-cast concrete kerb laid on 150mm concrete bed and backing, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense base 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Service Ducts: Black UPVC service ducts 100mm internal diameter with a minimum wall thickness of 5mm to BS4660 with Type S bed and surround laid to 500mm invert. Cable warning marker shall be laid 100mm above all ducting. All ducting to include 5mm diameter polyethylene draw cord breaking weight 5.9KN (1220lb) and be mandrel tested.

Draw Pits: 450mm x 450mm Pre-formed polyethylene chamber up to 1000mm deep, 100mm concrete base and surround with a Class C250 cover and frame.

Footpath: 150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete bed and backing, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense base 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Service Ducts: Black UPVC service ducts 100mm internal diameter with a minimum wall thickness of 5mm to BS4660 with Type S bed and surround laid to 500mm invert. Cable warning marker shall be laid 100mm above all ducting. All ducting to include 5mm diameter polyethylene draw cord breaking weight 5.9KN (1220lb) and be mandrel tested.

Draw Pits: 450mm x 450mm Pre-formed polyethylene chamber up to 1000mm deep, 100mm concrete base and surround with a Class C250 cover and frame.

1 no. court (most northerly) to be provided to and open for public use from school closing until 7pm during term time, and from 9am to 7pm out of term times.

Existing northern section of Turin Road open space to become a new community orchard with low maintenance wildflower meadow. Remaining area of Turin Road Open Space to be improved in terms of litter and grounds maintenance before handing over to Parks Team. Community Orchard to be comprised of 18no. trees, varieties to include Plum, Cherry, Pear and Apple of medium to large size 18/20, planted in rotivated and improved soil, with nitrogen fixings to allow for quick establishment.

Trees are to be managed and maintained in line with the London Borough of Enfield Corporate Tree Maintenance Strategy.

Porous Asphalt:

150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete base 150mm thick, MOT Type 3 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 open bin 160/220 binder course 50mm thick, PA6 surf 70/100 25mm thick surface course.

Footpath:

150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete base and backing, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense bin 40/60 binder course 60mm thick, AC6 dense surf 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Additional Car Parking Area:

205 x 150 mm pre-cast concrete kerb laid on 150mm concrete bed and backing, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense base 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Service Ducts:

Black UPVC service ducts 100mm internal diameter with a minimum wall thickness of 5mm to BS4660 with Type S bed and surround laid to 500mm invert. Cable warning marker shall be laid 100mm above all ducting. All ducting to include 5mm diameter polyethylene draw cord breaking weight 5.9KN (1220lb) and be mandrel tested.

Draw Pits:

450mm x 450mm Pre-formed polyethylene chamber up to 1000mm deep, 100mm concrete base and surround with a Class C250 cover and frame.

Footpath:

150 x 50mm pre-cast concrete edging laid on 100mm concrete bed and backing, geotextile membrane Terram T1000 or equivalent, MOT Type 1 sub base 150mm thick, AC20 dense base 100/150 25mm thick surface course.

Service Ducts:

Black UPVC service ducts 100mm internal diameter with a minimum wall thickness of 5mm to BS4660 with Type S bed and surround laid to 500mm invert. Cable warning marker shall be laid 100mm above all ducting. All ducting to include 5mm diameter polyethylene draw cord breaking weight 5.9KN (1220lb) and be mandrel tested.

Draw Pits:

450mm x 450mm Pre-formed polyethylene chamber up to 1000mm deep, 100mm concrete base and surround with a Class C250 cover and frame.
## LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Date:** 18th July 2017

**Report of**
Assistant Director, Regeneration & Planning

**Contact Officer:**
- Andy Higham
- Sharon Davidson
- Ms Kathy Schuh
- Tel No: 0208 379 3938

**Ward:**
Enfield Highway

**Ref:** 17/02280/RE4

**Category:** LBE - Dev by LA

**LOCATION:** 201 Hertford Road, Enfield, EN3 5JH,

**PROPOSAL:**
Change of use of first floor from office space to a public lending library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Name &amp; Address:</th>
<th>Agent Name &amp; Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr Barry Skelton</td>
<td>Mr Marc Eagles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td>273 High Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Street</td>
<td>Epping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM16 4DA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That planning permission be **APPROVED** subject to conditions.

**Note for Members:**
The applicant is informed that an advertisement consent application is required to signpost users of the library.
1. Site and surroundings

1.1 The application site comprises of a 4-storey building located on the eastern side of Hertford Road. The building is occupied by the “Enfield Business Centre” and adjoins a two-storey retail parade to the south. In front of the building, there is a forecourt with decorative signposting and disabled parking space.

1.2 In the northernmost part of the building, there are four flats at numbers 203, 205, 207 and 209 Hertford Road over the three upper floors. North of the parade, there is an access path that leads to the rear where there is a metal gate. North of the access path, there is a car mechanic. East of the gate, there are four large waste wheelie bins. In the rear yard, there are 28 car parking spaces and as visible from the rear yard, there are screened residential exterior walkways.

1.3 The first and part of the second floor of the Enfield Business Centre are currently vacant. The ground floor is in use as offices by the Enfield Enterprise (B1a). The last use of the first floor was by the North London Chamber of Commerce and Enfield Retailers association. The net internal first floor area is 316 square metres and this includes toilets and a kitchen. On the first floor, there is a meeting room to the east that has a floor area of 48 square metres and a central room with floor areas of 200 square metres.

1.4 The site is located within a low PTAL area (2). There are regular bus services operating along Hertford Road with the nearest southbound bus stop located approximately 40m south of the site, outside of the Blackhorse Public House. The nearest northbound bus stop is on the opposite side of the road, immediately north of the library car park entrance. Southbury Road National rail station is approximately 1.7km to the south and Brimsdown National Rail station is 1.5km to the east.

1.5 The property is located within The Enfield Highway Large Local centre, as designated within the North East Enfield Area Action Plan.

2. Proposal

2.1 The proposal is for the change of use of first floor from office space to a public lending library.

2.2 It is proposed that the Enfield Highway library would be restricted to operate between the hours of 09:00 and 19:00, Mondays to Fridays and 9:00 to 17:00 on Saturdays, but not on Sundays. The library would operate under a shared location ‘community library’ model with view to being self-service and being operated by a technological security system, targeting users over 18 years of age; children must be accompanied by an adult. Initially maintained by one staff, the library would aim to be staffless, manned by an on-site security guard. On the interior, there would be a children’s’ area, a soft seating zone, six computer work stations, two study tables and four book shelves.

2.3 The existing parking provisions would be shared, and the existing waste provisions would be retained.
3. **Relevant Planning History:**

   The relevant planning history for the application site is as follows:

   3.1 AD/09/0062 - Granted with conditions 14.08.2009  
   *Installation of externally illuminated fascia sign, externally illuminated projecting sign and lettering to window.*

   3.2 P13-02216LBE - Granted with conditions 28.10.2013  
   *Single storey front extension.*

   3.3 14/03593/CND - Granted 30.10.2014  
   *Details to P13-02216LBE for surfacing materials (condition 3), existing and proposed ground levels (4), construction of access roads and junctions (5) and planting scheme (6) for a single storey front extension.*

   3.4 15/03401/PREAPP - Closed 25.08.2015  
   *Proposed installation of roof mounted solar photo-voltaic panels.*

   3.5 16/01619/CEA - Granted 22.06.2016  
   *Installation of solar panels on the roof.*

4. **Consultation**

   **Public**

   4.1 33 neighbouring occupiers were notified in respect of the proposal. The consultation period commenced on the 1st of June 2017 and ended 22nd of June. No responses received.

   **Internal**

   4.2 Environmental Health - no objection.

   4.3 Environmental Health does not object to the application for planning permission, as there is unlikely to be a negative environmental impact. In particular there are no concerns regarding air quality, noise or contaminated land.

   4.4 Traffic and Transportation - objection addressed by additional information submitted and conditions placed accordingly, as discussed below.

5. **Relevant Policy**

   5.1 London Plan (2016)

   Policy 4.1 Developing London’s economy
   Policy 4.2 Offices
   Policy 6.3 Assessing the effects of development on transport capacity
   Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport
   Policy 6.9 Cycling
   Policy 6.10 Walking
   Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
   Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
   Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.1 Building London’s neighbourhoods and communities
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.5 Public realm
Policy 7.6 Architecture

5.2 Core Strategy

CP11: Recreation, Leisure, Culture and Arts
CP17: Town Centres
CP19: Offices
CP24: The road network
CP25: Pedestrians and cyclists
CP26: Public transport
CP30: Maintaining and improving the quality of the built and open environment

5.3 Development Management Document

DMD 8 General Standards for New Residential Development
DMD 16 Provision of new community facilities
DMD 17 Protection of Community Facilities
DMD 22 Loss of Employment Outside of Designated Areas
DMD 28 Large Local Centres, Small Local Centres and Local Parades
DMD 37 Achieving high quality and design-led development
DMD 45 Parking standards and layout
DMD 47 New Roads, Access and Servicing
DMD81 Landscaping

5.4 Other

Enfield Council Library Development Strategy 2015 - 2018
Enfield Local Heritage List Consultation Draft September 2016
Infrastructure Delivery Plan Review 2014
Infrastructure Delivery Plan Review - Supporting Schedules
National Policy Guidance
The National Planning Policy Framework

6. Analysis

6.1 The key considerations in the determination of this planning application are the principle of the change of use, neighbouring amenity and vehicle access/servicing arrangements. Consideration must also be given to the previous planning application with reference: P13-02216LBE for the single storey extension to front elevation of existing building, dated 28.10.2013, whereby drainage, landscaping and parking arrangements for the offices were made. This permission has been implemented.

Background

6.2 The Enfield Highway library was traditionally located across the road from the application site at number 258 Hertford Road, EN3 5BN. and is of local significance in age, historic association, architectural quality and social value. The building has been opened first in 1910 and carries a decoration above
The door that reads ‘1909 - Carnegie library’. Cost of £4,000 was donated by Andrew Carnegie.

6.3 The Library Development Strategy 2015-2018 sets out the restructure of the library service and the four biggest and most popular libraries in the borough - Enfield Town, Edmonton Green, Palmers Green and Ordnance Unity Library, are specified as hub/flagship libraries - which deliver a wide range of library services alongside community based activities. The remaining 13 libraries were designated as community libraries. In community libraries, the Council shares premises with other organizations to bring in income, share costs and provide added benefits to the local community.

6.4 Enfield Highway Library is located 1.5 km south of Ordnance Unity centre that opened in December 2014, a library with modern up to date facilities. Located 1.4 km to the south is Ponders End Library that is also a community library and shares space within facilities with Age UK Enfield.

6.5 The Library Strategy reflects the Council’s vision for libraries to be considered as part of the overall Council service offer to communities, a digital network offering WI-FI, improved computer facilities with a range of digital inclusion activities; greater involvement by local communities in the management of library services through a variety of different models and facilitated access to government services such as education, welfare reform, economic growth and wellbeing.

6.6 This is also reflected in the Enfield Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan Review 2014, that refers to dynamic libraries that play a key role to the Council’s Corporate Plan, whereby libraries are integrated into Community Hub facilities.

6.7 In anticipation of a partnering with a Sexual Health Clinic, the Carnegie library has been vacated, but the scheme did not proceed. In the interim, a temporary Library Service temporarily operates from a library bus located in the car park of number 258 Hertford Road.

6.8 The application follows on from a key decision made by the Cabinet member for Education, Children’s Services and protection (Cllr Ayfer Orhan) on the 19th of June 2017. A report titled ‘Enfield Highway Library Re-provision at Enfield Business Centre’ was agreed. The approval was given to provide a new Community library on the first floor of 201 Hertford Road, Enfield Highway, working with Enfield Business Centre as community partner. The proposal was considered the most cost effective solution for a Library service located adjacent to the original Enfield Highway Library, as the first floor of the Enfield Business Centre is currently vacant and owned by the Council.

6.9 The report identified that the site is designated as Class B1 - Offices. The use class for libraries is D1 - Non-residential institutions and this application seeks formal change of use.
6.10 Policy 19 of the Core Strategy accepts the conversion of surplus offices to other uses where it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for offices in this location. The applicant has indicated that the offices are currently vacant. The offices were vacant for circa 3 years and have been marketed extensively for the past 18 months, during which time 3 viewings were had.
The property does not give rise to demand, as it is a tertiary location and low-grade office accommodation.

6.11 DMD Policy 22 states that the proposals involving a change of use that would result in a loss or reduction of employment outside of Strategic Industrial Locations (SIL) or Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS) will be refused, unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable and viable for continued use employment use.

6.12 The proposal for the library to operate as staffless would have implications in terms of employment provision. This is contrary to the traditional library model, and there is currently one person employed in the temporary library bus. Nevertheless, the proposed development is in sink with ambitions, as set out in the Library Strategy. The submission has satisfactorily demonstrated that there is a lack of demand for the office use and on this basis an alternative use can be considered.

Library Use

6.13 DMD 16 relates to the provision of new community facilities that will be supported borough-wide, provided the proposed development:

a. Is demonstrated to have a community need;
b. Makes an efficient and effective use of land and buildings, and where appropriate, provides opportunities for co-location, flexible spaces and multi-use;
c. Is easily accessible to the community it is intended to serve by walking, cycling and public transport to reduce dependence upon private car transport;
d. Is designed to provide access for physically impaired users, in accordance with DMD 37 'Achieving High Quality and Design-Led Development';
e. Does not harm the amenities of neighbouring and nearby properties;
f. Does not have a negative impact on the area in terms of the potential traffic generated. Development should be located in local centres and town centres or edge of centres where appropriate, depending on the scale of development.

6.14 The library strategy has identified the need for a community library at the Enfield Highway location. Nevertheless, and alongside investments nearby at Ponders End and Ordnance Unity, the existing library provisions at this location are being scaled back. The use of the vacant first floor Enfield Business Centre, where residents are offered business support by Enfield Enterprise, would make efficient and effective use of land and buildings. The community library would be the only library within a 500 metres wide catchment centred around Enfield Highway and is served by regular bus services. The wide entrance to the business centre is wheelchair accessible and there is a lift to the first floor. The centre is designed and located, so that it would not harm the amenities of neighbouring and nearby development. The expected numbers of visitors would be similar or lower to that currently attending the Southgate Town Hall community library, which are approximately 200-400 visitors per week. It is considered that the proposal fully complies with policy DMD16.

6.15 A separate advertisement application would need to be submitted to signpost users to the proposed library.
6.16 Officers consider that the proposed use of the first floors as a library would constitute a use that would encourage community involvement as well as provide facilities to improve skills within the local area. The development would enable the reuse of otherwise vacant floors within the building for community purposes and taking into consideration the hours of operation, between 9:00 and 19:00, during the week and also on Saturdays between 9:00 - 17:00, it is considered that the proposal would enhance the vitality and viability of this part of Hertford Road.

6.17 Furthermore, the proposal would complement the existing use of the ground floor Enfield Business Centre, whereby existing office users are Enterprise Enfield, who specialises in business advice. The library opening times would correspond with office users on the ground floor and arrangements would need to be made for opening hours on Saturdays. The proposed development is not considered to conflict with other users of the building.

6.18 The proposed change of use would not involve any external alterations to the building. The layout seeks to retain the existing room configuration and positioning of services. Isolated adaptation of access control to the ground floor of the Business Centre is required to maintain security at the facility whilst allowing public access to the lift and first floor library. At first floor level, alterations will be required to provide an accessible WC. Isolated repairs will be undertaken to the ceiling and lighting, heating and ventilation system shall be serviced and retained with small power provision modified to suit the proposed layout.

6.19 Overall, given the existing use of the ground floor, the vacancy of the first and second floors and the nature of the use proposed, the principle of the change of use is considered acceptable. A condition is recommended to ensure the development remains as a library within D1 to ensure that any proposed change within the Use Class requires separate planning consent. This is to ensure that any future development does not result in the over-intensive use of the site and meets adopted car-parking standards.

Neighbouring Amenity

6.20 Environmental Health raised no objections to the proposed change of use. It is noted that the library would operate between the hours of 09:00 and 19:00, Mondays to Fridays and 9:00 to 17:00 on Saturdays, but not on Sundays. The applicant has advised that there would initially be one member of staff, and a phased-in staffless service. In any case, the intensity of the use would be self-limiting due to the limited floor area of the premises and required visitor-space ratios.

6.21 The part of Hertford Road, where the site is situated, comprises of predominantly town centre uses, however, the northern end of the business centre retains some residential development. North of the access path, there is a car mechanic. On balance, it is considered that the proposed activities of the community library, the expected number of users, together with the hours of opening and the local centre location, would not be likely to result in a level of noise and disturbance over and above that already experienced along Hertford Road, that would be detrimental to the amenities of nearby neighbouring residential and office and retail occupiers. In any event, it is considered that a condition restricting the opening hours of the premises would ensure the privacy and general amenity of nearby neighbouring
occupiers would be maintained. The condition will restrict the opening to 09:00 - 19:00 Mondays to Fridays and 09:00 - 17:00 on Saturdays.

6.22 The four adjoining flats, numbers 203, 205, 207 and 209 Hertford Road are accessed from and located in a different part of the building. The access to the flats is located along the northern side of the building and the flats are located on the upper floors only. The fenestration to the flats is to the front and rear of the property and the parking spaces and bin provisions are located in the rear courtyard. Visitors to the library could come into contact with residents if they were to access the rear courtyard for visitor parking however there would be no direct impact on residential amenity. There would be four library parking spaces to the rear and any disturbances caused are not considered to differ substantially from those currently incurred by the use as an office.

Vehicle Access/ Servicing Arrangements

6.23 This application has been inspected by the Council’s Traffic and Transportation Department, who requested additional information, which has been obtained as part of a site survey and submission of additional information. The existing provisions include a loading bay, a disabled parking bay, 4 short term cycle parking spaces, *i.e.* two Sheffield hoops in front of the building, 28 car parking spaces to the rear and three large commercial waste bins. Traffic and Transportation have advised that a number of additional provisions would have to be made for the library. These include:

- One additional cycle hoop in front of the building;
- One additional disabled parking bay in front of the building;
- One secure and sheltered long term cycle parking space; and
- The designation of four car parking spaces for users of the library.

6.24 The above would be secured through conditions. Hard-surfacing and drainage provisions were previously agreed under planning reference: P13-02216LBE. It is considered that one large wheelie bin for use by the library for commercial waste, as transferred from the previous occupier, is sufficient. The current application relates to the first floor of the building where planning permission is sought for the change of its use from office (B1) to a library use (D1) for a maximum of 1 staff accessing the site during opening hours and 4 car parking spaces would be provided.

6.25 The existing 28 car parking spaces are shared between residents and office users and while there are allocations attributed in respective leases, these would need to be signposted more clearly before the library would open to the public, so as to minimise any potential conflicts. Additional cycle parking provisions promote active travel in line with DMD 45 and the London Plan Policy 6.9 (cycle parking). A minimum of 2 additional cycle parking spaces should be provided for visitors of the library in line with the standards set out in the London Plan (2016) and DMD 45 (Parking Standards and Layout).

6.26 Transport have also enquired into the number of trips generated and data for similar sized libraries suggests a footfall of 200-400 people per week. This would increase footfall compared to that currently attracted by the temporary library van, however as the majority of users would be on foot, cycle or public transport, this increase is not considered sufficient to have a significant impact on highway safety.
6.27 In addition, and in order to alleviate any conflicts that may arise, an additional condition would be placed for a travel planning statement to be submitted as per guidance set out in the TfL Travel Planning Guidance (2013). The provision of such a statement should demonstrate how staff and visitors would be encouraged to travel to the site via sustainable transport modes and to reduce reliance on the private car.

6.28 Overall, due to the limited internal floor space and the subsequent limitations this will impose on staff and visitors at any one time, it is not thought that the proposed change of use will lead to significant levels of increased trip generation, which will adversely affect the smooth operation of the surrounding local highway network.

7. Conclusion

7.1 Officers consider that the proposed change of use from office to a library would provide a positive community use for the surrounding area, while bringing a vacant building into a sustainable use. The proposal is not considered to have a deferential impact on residential amenity or highway safety.

8. Recommendation

8.1 Having regard to the above, it is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

**Conditions**

1. **Time Limit**

   The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the decision notice.

   Reason: To comply with the provisions of S.51 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. **Approved Plans**

   The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   207016694/03/OF/07;
   207016694/04/OF/07;
   4001-5155865;
   3562(03)002;
   3562(20)003; and
   3562(03)003.

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. **Hours of use**
The library shall not be used outside the hours of 09:00 to 19:00 Monday – Friday and Saturdays 9:00 to 17:00.

Reason: In the interest of neighbouring residential amenity.

4. Cycle Parking

Prior to the occupation of the development, the applicants shall erect an additional cycle hoop for visitors and one secure and sheltered long term cycle parking space.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport and to ensure that traffic generated from the site is minimised, in accordance with London Plan policies 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and development management plan policies DMD 8, 45 and 47.

5. Parking Spaces

Prior to the occupation of the development, details of 4 designated parking space and 1 additional blue badge holder parking space to be provided in accordance with the standards adopted by the Local Planning Authority have been submitted to and approved in writing. The facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied and shall be maintained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with Transport standards adopted, as set out in London Plan policy 6.13 and development management plan policy DPD 45.

6. Travel Plan

The development hereby approved shall be occupied until such time as a Travel Plan Statement incorporating the components set out in the current “Travel Planning Guidance” issued by TfL has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan Statement shall include:

(1) Effective positive measures aimed at promoting sustainable travel and for the ongoing monitoring of the Travel Plan;
(2) An effective action plan for implementation of the measures;
(3) A commitment to delivering the Travel Plan objectives for a period of at least five years from first occupation of the development; and
(4) Effective mechanisms to achieve the objectives of the travel plan by both present and future occupiers of the development. The development shall be implemented only in accordance with the approved travel plan.

The approved Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented and adhered to.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport and to ensure that traffic generated from the site is minimised, in accordance with London Plan policies 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and development management plan policies DMD 8, 45 and 47.

7. Restricted Use
The development hereby permitted shall only be used as a library within use class D1 and for no other purpose whatsoever.

Reason: To ensure the development does not represent an over intensive or inappropriate use of the site and in accordance with core strategy policy CP11 and development management plan policies 16 and 17.