

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 26 JUNE 2008**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Alan Barker, Henry Pipe, Chaudhury Anwar MBE, Jayne Buckland, Andreas Constantinides, Dogan Delman, Annette Dreblow, Peter Fallart, Ahmet Hasan, Chris Joannides, Dino Lemonides, Donald McGowan, Anne-Marie Pearce, Toby Simon and Terence Smith

ABSENT Jonas Hall and Kieran McGregor

OFFICERS: Bob Ayton (Schools Organisation & Development), Andy Higham (Area Planning Manager), Julian Jackson (Head of Development Control), John Lynch (Interim Borough Planning Officer), Steve Jaggard (Section Manager – Transportation Control), David Snell (Area Planning Manager), Keith Trowell (Legal), Bob Oxley (Webcasting), Jane Creer (Secretary) and Ann Redondo (Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillors Glynis Vince and Edward Smith
Approximately 20 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives
Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group

98

WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT

The Chairman welcomed attendees and new members to the Planning Committee, congratulated Councillor Simon as new Labour lead member, and introduced Keith Trowell, Legal representative, who read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

99

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

NOTED apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jonas Hall and Kieran McGregor.

100

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

NOTED

1. Councillor Buckland declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application TP/08/0804 – Public House, 56, Victoria Road, London, N9 9SU as she had been involved in consultation around the application, and left the room when this item was considered.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

2. Councillor Delman declared a personal interest in application TP/08/0804 – Public House, 56, Victoria Road, London, N9 9SU as he personally knew the applicant, and left the room when this item was considered.

101 MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 21 May 2008 be confirmed as a correct record.

102 ENFIELD DESIGN AWARDS 2007

RECEIVED the report of the Director of Place Shaping and Enterprise (Report No. 31).

NOTED

1. The comments of Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group (CAG), including:
 - (i) CAG and the Council had shared objectives to reward those who put up buildings of excellence in the borough.
 - (ii) The budget was tightly managed, but it had been possible to produce a high quality awards brochure.
 - (iii) He appreciated Planning Committee Members' approval and guidance for the fourth event planned for 2009.
2. The Interim Borough Planning Officer's confirmation that the awards were an established part of Enfield's calendar and would continue to be so.
3. Planning Committee noted the review of the Enfield Design Awards 2007 and the proposals for the Enfield Design Awards 2009.

103 REPORT OF THE INTERIM BOROUGH PLANNING OFFICER (REPORT NO. 30)

RECEIVED the report of the Interim Borough Planning Officer.

104 APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

NOTED that a copy of those applications dealt with under delegated powers was available in the Members' Library and via the Council website.

105 ORDER OF AGENDA

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

106

TP/08/0804 - PUBLIC HOUSE, 56, VICTORIA ROAD, LONDON, N9 9SU

NOTED

1. Receipt of an additional letter of objection, from the occupier of no. 57, Victoria Road, raising concerns that the proximity of plant machinery would lead to noise and affect their health, that use of the parking area would cause noise and general disturbance, and that existing residents' ability to park their cars would be affected.
2. Receipt of a letter of support from the Edmonton Green Town Centre Manager, on the basis that the proposal would support regeneration of the area.
3. An amendment to Condition 12 in relation to required details of works and dedication of the footway to the Council.
4. An amendment to Condition 16 in relation to the travel plan.
5. The deputation of Mr Stuart Mager, including:
 - (i) He was a chartered quantity surveyor, speaking on behalf of Mr and Mrs Bynoe, neighbouring residents, who were out of the country and unable to attend the meeting.
 - (ii) Mr and Mrs Bynoe were senior citizens, had lived in their property for over 30 years, and had a number of concerns regarding this proposal.
 - (iii) There would be a vent directly adjacent to their property.
 - (iv) The driveway gate would be mechanised and may be noisy.
 - (v) Parking in the area was already difficult.
 - (vi) Concerns about the height and massing of the building adjacent to no. 57 and directly opposite a lovely park.
 - (vii) The modern design would be out of keeping with the area.
 - (viii) The building line would creep ahead of the line of no. 57 and exacerbate shadowing. As well as loss of light there would be overlooking.
 - (ix) Traffic, noise and fumes would increase.
6. The response of Mr Ahmet Hussein, architect, including:
 - (i) Full details in relation to the building line were set out in the design and access statement and in the officers' report.
 - (ii) Issues in relation to plant and vent noise were addressed by Conditions 4 and 8, and there would be mitigating measures including an acoustic wall or fence on the boundary with no. 57.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

- (iii) The plant room would be fully insulated, all machinery would have anti-vibration mountings, and there would be landscaping and trees.
 - (iv) Any heat produced would be nominal and would dissipate before the boundary of no. 57, and plant would have built in filters to ensure good air quality for all surrounding residents.
 - (v) The proposed surgery would close earlier and generate less traffic and disturbance than the previous use as a public house.
 - (vi) The gates would stay open during surgery opening hours, and the gate machinery would be buried in the ground.
 - (vii) There had been a traffic impact assessment and he believed there was adequate parking space availability in the area. A travel plan also proposed 100% subsidised travel passes for staff and free pick up service for patients.
 - (viii) The design had been amended further to negotiations with planning officers; the building had been reduced in height, and moved to the middle of the site.
7. The planning officer's clarification in relation to staff accommodation and additional flats, parking spaces and cycle parking provision.
 8. The planning officer's advice in relation to Condition 2 and construction working hours, and Members' request that a later start on a Saturday morning be considered.
 9. Councillor Simon's request that Condition 4 be amended to reflect air and ground borne noise.
 10. Councillor Dreblow's request for an additional condition regarding use of obscure glazing which is fixed shut to safeguard amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

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

Amendment to Condition 12

No development shall be occupied until

- a) works to reinstate the footway on the corner of Victoria Road and Park Road have been carried out in accordance with details to be agreed by the local planning authority and thereafter, the footway is dedicated to the Council;
- b) ensure works are carried out to reinstate as footway the current access points that have come redundant, prior to the development being occupied;
- c) provide for the making of a new Traffic Regulation Order to implement enhanced waiting restrictions near the site, with such new waiting restrictions implemented prior to the development being occupied; and
- d) the access points shown on the approved plans are provided before occupation of the development.

Amendment to Condition 16

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

No development shall commence until details of a travel plan to include details of a scheme to provide 100% subsidised passes for public transport to all staff for a minimum period of 5 years have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented prior to first use of the development hereby approved and retained for a minimum period of 5 years from that date.

Additional Condition to read

The window in the rear facing elevation of the projecting bay feature inserted in the northern flank elevation of the development hereby approved shall be fitted with obscure glazing and fixed shut unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the residential amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

107

TP/08/0551 - 19, 21 AND 23, WAVERLEY ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 7BP

NOTED

1. Receipt of two additional letters of objection, including that over the last 25 years the road had suffered a change in identity, becoming very busy with numerous flats, that this proposal would generate even more traffic, cause loss of outlook and loss of family dwellings.
2. Receipt of a letter of objection from Councillor Glynis Vince, ward councillor, that the proposal would be overdevelopment of the site and the area.
3. The planning officer's clarification of previous planning decisions in relation to this site and advice regarding recent relevant appeals, and other flat developments approved in the area.
4. The planning officer's confirmation that the relationship with the adjoining attached property at no. 25 had been satisfactorily addressed.
5. The deputation of Mr Nick Powell, local resident, including:
 - (i) His home was directly opposite no. 25 Waverley Road, which would abut the new development. The proposal would have a significant effect on the enjoyment of his home.
 - (ii) He, and surrounding neighbours, considered the proposal substantially the same as the application previously rejected, and the previous reasons for refusal remained valid.
 - (iii) The density level of the flats would be too high.
 - (iv) The flats would be four storeys high and in an elevated position. Light would be blocked to the rear of nos. 17 and 25, Waverley Road.
 - (v) The design was appalling, abutting half of a pair of semi-detached homes in an unsympathetic way, alien to the character of the road.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

- (vi) The amenities and value of no. 25, which was occupied by an elderly widow, would be affected.
 - (vii) The proposal would result in severe traffic and parking issues. There would be extra traffic movements and on-street parking in an already congested road and potential for accidents.
 - (viii) Much needed family dwellings would be replaced by flats, with the area becoming less varied and sustainable.
 - (ix) 'Garden grabbing' such as this should be discouraged.
6. The statement of Councillor Glynis Vince, Ward Councillor, including:
- (i) She had strong concerns about this application and supported residents' objections.
 - (ii) 30 years ago this was a very pleasant road of detached houses, but over 200 individual flats had been added in the last 10 years.
 - (iii) Waverley Road was fully parked during both daytime and evenings.
 - (iv) Members were requested to make a site visit as they needed to fully appreciate the potential impact on residents.
7. The response of Mr Richard Lotherington, a director of Chase Green Developments Ltd, the agent, including:
- (i) Chase Green Developments was a small company set up two years ago, which had completed several local developments to very high design standards.
 - (ii) There was already planning permission for a block of 17 flats on this site. The loss of houses on this site had already been accepted.
 - (iii) The omission of no. 25 from the application was regrettable, but was a response to personal circumstances with the occupier. Great care had been taken to minimise the impact on no. 25.
 - (iv) The development would pick up the texture and rhythms of nos 25, 15 and 17.
 - (v) The proposals met UDP guidelines including for distancing.
 - (vi) Residents opposite with objections were located 30 metres away, across the road.
 - (vii) The proposed car park at the rear was in the same position as the approved scheme. Car access would be through the middle of the site and not close to boundaries, and the access would be of sufficient width to allow two vehicles to pass.
 - (viii) There had been no traffic related reason for refusal previously.
 - (ix) Parking provision was in line with the London Plan.
 - (x) All reasons for the previous refusal had been addressed. This proposal was a sensitive response to the issues and constraints of the site.
8. The planning officer's advice in response to queries regarding cumulative effects of flat developments, comparison with other local approved schemes and relevant appeal outcomes, amenity space and parking provision, and density.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

9. The planning officer's further confirmation that relationships between buildings were now considered satisfactory and that property issues were covered by other legislation.
10. Members' continuing concerns about the incongruity of the proposal, its size, massing, design, relationship to no. 25 and parking issues.
11. The planning officer's further advice regarding details of the access road and car park, and that parking provision was compliant with the London Plan.
12. The planning officer's advice regarding the Planning Inspector's decision in respect of the development at no. 20a – 22, Waverley Road.
13. The Head of Development Control's further advice in respect of density.
14. Councillor Pipe's proposal that planning permission be refused for reasons relating to its relationship with the retained property at no. 25, size, massing, overlooking, and amenity space.
15. The Legal representative's advice regarding appropriateness of proposed reasons for refusal
16. Councillor Simon's view that the officers' recommendation should be accepted, and that the architect had proposed an imaginative solution to develop the site.
17. The Chairman's proposal that Members should make a visit to the site, supported by the committee.
18. Councillor Simon's request that Members be provided with more detailed plans to illustrate this application.
19. Councillor Hasan left the meeting at this point to go to another appointment.

AGREED that a decision be deferred to give Members the opportunity to make a site visit.

108

TP/08/0165 - 42, HIGH STREET, LONDON, N14 6EB

NOTED

1. Receipt of an additional ten letters of objection from residents of The Meadway and High Street, including that the proposal would lead to further traffic congestion and affect road safety, increases in noise pollution, litter, rodent numbers and cooking odours, that groups of

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 26.6.2008

students would be attracted, that the character of the conservation area and estate should be protected, that further loss of shops should be resisted and that there were enough cafes in the area.

2. An amendment to Condition 6 to correct the word "rear" to "area" (end of line 2).
3. The statement of Councillor Edward Smith, Ward Councillor, including:
 - (i) He was representing local residents, especially in the Meadway Estate.
 - (ii) Since the previous Planning Committee meeting, the level of take away business had been clarified, but there was still major opposition from local residents who continued to have a number of concerns.
 - (iii) Another restaurant was not needed in the parade as there were several others nearby, and would cause loss of amenity and lower quality of life for Meadway residents.
 - (iv) Residents' concerns about the likely customer base; local students had a poor reputation and groups of youths could be intimidating. Also many may come by car and exacerbate current parking problems.
4. Councillor Fallart's concern to ensure bins were secure and lidded.

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

109

LBE/08/0003 - DERBY ROAD, OFF KENNINGHALL ROAD, LONDON, N18 2PE

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

110

TP/06/2368/REN1 - 875, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 2QS

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

111

TP/08/0205 - 111, TOTTENHALL ROAD, LONDON, N13 6JA

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

112

GARFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, SPRINGFIELD ROAD, LONDON, N11 1RR

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

113

TP/08/0596 - 70-74, FOREST HOUSE, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 6BE

NOTED

1. Receipt of an additional letter of objection from the freeholder of Clockhouse Parade.
2. The planning officer's further advice in respect of shared access issues.

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

114

TP/08/0982 - ST EDMUNDS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON, N9 7HJ

NOTED an alteration to the proposal to read "Installation of a 3 metre high powder coated weld mesh fence to eastern boundary".

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

115

TOWN PLANNING APPEALS

NOTED the appeal information in the agenda pack.

All business of Planning Committee thus being concluded, the meeting ended at 8.50 pm.