

Public Document Pack



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Thursday, 26th June, 2008 at 7.30 pm
Venue: Conference Room
The Civic Centre, Silver Street,
Enfield, Middlesex, EN1 3XA

Contact: Jane Creer / Kasey Knight
Committee Administrator
Direct : 020-8379- 4093 / 4187
Tel: 020-8379-1000
Ext: 4093 / 4187
Fax: 020-8379-3177
Textphone: 020 8379 4419
E-mail: jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk
kasey.knight@enfield.gov.uk
Council website: www.enfield.gov.uk

MEMBERS

Councillors : Alan Barker (Chairman), Henry Pipe (Vice-Chairman),
Chaudhury Anwar MBE, Jayne Buckland, Andreas Constantinides, Don Delman,
Annette Dreblow, Peter Fallart, Jonas Hall, Ahmet Hasan, Chris Joannides, Dino
Lemonides, Donald McGowan, Kieran McGregor, Anne-Marie Pearce, Toby Simon
and Terence Smith

N.B. Members of the public are advised that the order of business on the agenda may be altered at the discretion of the Committee.

Any member of the public interested in attending the meeting should ensure that they arrive promptly at 7.15pm.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded for possible live and future broadcasting on the Council's website.

AGENDA – PART 1

1. WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT
2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (Pages 1 - 2)

Members of the Planning Committee are invited to identify any personal or prejudicial interests relevant to items on the agenda. Please refer to the guidance note attached to the agenda.

4. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 12)

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2008.

5. ENFIELD DESIGN AWARDS 2007 (Pages 13 - 16)

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

(INF)

6. REPORT OF THE INTERIM BOROUGH PLANNING OFFICER (REPORT NO. 30) (Pages 17 - 98)

6.1 Applications dealt with under delegated powers.
(A copy is available in the Members Library)


6.2 Planning Applications and applications to display advertisements.

6.3 Appeal information
Section 1: New Town Planning Application Appeals
Section 2: Decisions on Town Planning Application Appeals.

7. 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)

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART - QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF



Note: If in any doubt about a potential interest, members are asked to seek advice from Democratic Services in advance of the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 21 MAY 2008****COUNCILLORS**

PRESENT Alan Barker, Henry Pipe, Chaudhury Anwar MBE, Andreas Constantinides, Peter Fallart, Jonas Hall, Ahmet Hasan, Chris Joannides, Kieran McGregor, Anne-Marie Pearce, Toby Simon and Terence Smith

ABSENT Jayne Buckland, Dogan Delman, Annette Dreblow, Christiana During and Donald McGowan

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), Keith Trowell (Legal), John Austin (Assistant Director - Corporate Governance), George Sims (Head of Planning Policy, Projects and Design), Brian Wright and Bob Oxley (Webcasting), Jane Creer (Secretary) and Kasey Knight (Secretary)

Also Attending: Councillors John Boast, Edward Smith and Christopher Cole
Approximately 30 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives
Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group

20**WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed attendees and new members to the Planning Committee and introduced Keith Trowell, Legal representative, who read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

21**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED apologies for absence were received from Councillors Delman and Dreblow.

22**MINUTES**

AGREED that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 17 April 2008 be confirmed as a correct record.

23**PLANNING COMMITTEE CODE OF PRACTICE**

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

NOTED

1. John Austin, Assistant Director of Corporate Governance highlighted the following points:
 - (i) The Planning Committee Code of Practice already formed part of the Council's Constitution (Part 5, Chapter 5.2).
 - (ii) It was linked to the Councillors' Code of Conduct, which was revised last year and agreed by Council. The opportunity had now been taken to propose revisions to the Planning Committee Code of Conduct to reflect the changes to the Councillors' Code.
 - (iii) The most substantial change related to new rules regarding prejudicial interests; a councillor with a prejudicial interest could now speak at meetings where the public had speaking rights. An amendment was proposed to the Planning Committee Code of Conduct such that councillors who were not members of the committee, with a prejudicial interest, who wished to make representations, should notify officers beforehand, in the same way that members of the public were required to.
 - (iv) Members' attention was also drawn to the Council's recent decision that councillors should not serve on both the Green Belt Forum and the Planning Committee.
 - (v) Members were invited to raise any questions or comments.
2. Councillor Simon's suggestion that the word 'non-committee' be omitted, and that any councillor with a prejudicial interest wishing to address the Planning Committee should give notice to Democratic Services officers in order that the applicant could be advised and allowed the right of reply.
3. Councillor McGregor's comment that members of the committee should not necessarily be subject to this requirement, as they may only become aware of a prejudicial interest during a meeting.
4. Members' agreement to a form of wording to allow for such unforeseeable occasions, such that councillors with a prejudicial interest should notify Democratic Services officers within the specified timeframe "or as soon as the interest is known".
5. Members would have further opportunities to comment as the revised Planning Committee Code of Practice would be considered by the Standards Committee and Constitution Review Group then presented to Council for agreement.

24

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

NOTED that there were no declarations of interest from Members present in relation to any items on the meeting agenda.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

25

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD AREA
ACTION PLAN PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT (REPORT NO. 16)**

RECEIVED the report of the Interim Director of Place Shaping and Enterprise (Report No. 16).

NOTED

1. George Sims, Head of Planning Policy, Projects and Design introduced the report and highlighted the following points:
 - (i) The North Circular Area Action Plan Preferred Options Report was published on 7th May 2008 for consultation until 18th June 2008.
 - (ii) Copies of the report were available in the Members' Library and on the Council website, and all ward councillors in the area affected had been provided with paper copies.
 - (iii) The Preferred Options Report set out a framework for future development of the North Circular Road area. The preferred options had been informed by consultation with key stakeholders and members of the public on last year's Issues and Options Report; 336 responses had been received, from a range of organisations and individuals.
 - (iv) At this stage, the Council was required to put forward its case for preferred planning policies on a sound evidence base.
 - (v) The next stage, having taken on board all comments received, would be preparation of a submission document for the Secretary of State and its formal examination in public.
 - (vi) Consultation on the Preferred Options Report included two public exhibitions: at Palmers Green Library from 13th to 23rd May, and at Bowes Road Library from 24th May to 6th June.
 - (vii) Members were asked to encourage residents and organisations to engage with the consultation.

2. Planning Committee noted the progress being made on the Local Development Framework, and that views were currently being sought on the North Circular Area Action Plan Preferred Options Report.

26

CONTRAVENTIONS (REPORT NO. 18)

NOTED the report summarising all Contraventions which were currently logged with the Planning Enforcement Team, and that further information regarding particular cases was available in the Members' Library and on the Council's website.

27

**REPORT OF THE INTERIM BOROUGH PLANNING OFFICER (REPORT
NO. 17)**

RECEIVED the report of the Interim Borough Planning Officer.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

28

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.

29

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.

30

TP/08/0085 - 864-866, HERTFORD ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 6UD

NOTED

1. Consideration of the application was deferred from the previous meeting of Planning Committee due to Members' concerns regarding indicative heights of the front, and particularly rear block, and the mix of size of accommodation.
2. These concerns were raised with the agent, leading to submission of a letter making the case to support the proposals, as indicated in the Note to Members. The agent had confirmed that his client was not prepared to make any amendments to the scheme proposed and would like to see the application considered as it stood.
3. An amendment to clarify that the proposal related to three matters: access, scale and siting.
4. The deputation of Mrs Christine Donnelly, including:
 - (i) She was speaking on behalf of the residents of nos. 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 Broadoak Avenue, whose gardens backed on to the site.
 - (ii) Distances between the proposed flats and Broadoak Avenue houses may conform to legal limits, but their homes would be overlooked, and suffer loss of privacy and loss of light.
 - (iii) Concerns about the agent's sun analysis plan, that only in June and July would there be no overshadowing.
 - (iv) The agent's assertion that there was no demand for 3-bed units was contrary to the views of Planning Committee members.
 - (v) There was the potential to have up to 46 people living in this small space, and up to 20 extra cars.
 - (vi) Nearby properties were predominantly 2 storey, with no 4 storey flats and this proposal would be out of keeping in the area.
 - (vii) The local environment would be changed for the worse.
5. The statement of Councillor John Boast, Turkey Street Ward Councillor, including:

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

- (i) Members expressed their concern at the previous meeting, and none of those concerns had been addressed.
 - (ii) The flats would not be on the same site where there were existing buildings; at least half the land was not currently built on, particularly that nearest to Broadoak Avenue residences.
 - (iii) The flats would dominate the rear of houses in Broadoak Avenue.
 - (iv) The proposal would not meet Strategic Objective 16 or 17 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Preferred Options.
 - (v) The proposed density exceeded the recommended range within the London Plan, and amenity space was below the level normally sought.
 - (vi) The officers' report acknowledged there would be impact to existing amenities of dwellings on Broadoak Avenue.
 - (vii) He asked the Committee to at least require a reduction in the height of the development, if not outright rejection of the application.
6. The response of Mr Kevin Hinds, the agent, including:
- (i) The statements which had been heard were assertions with no evidence to support them.
 - (ii) He had listened carefully to all concerns raised and briefed his client and concluded why changes were not being made in the letter to officers, following evaluation of technical matters.
 - (iii) He would like to give assurance that it would not be the case that residential amenity would be taken away.
 - (iv) Analysis showed that to take light away, the development would have to be 5 storeys high, therefore this proposal was satisfactory.
 - (v) The proposal was compatible with distancing policies.
7. In response to Members' queries, officers' advice in relation to compatibility with the existing street scene, covenants, and the demand for 3-bed units in the borough.
8. Councillor Simon's proposal that the application be approved, subject to a condition that there should be no windows on the north side of the block, which was not supported by a majority of the committee.
9. Advice of the Head of Development Control in relation to Members' discussion of reasons for refusal of planning permission.

AGREED that planning permission be refused for the following reason.

The proposed development by reason of its excessive density and resulting scale and massing, and in particular the scale and massing of the four storey elements of the scheme, would be out of keeping in the street scene and with the prevailing character and form of development in the locality. In this respect the proposal would be contrary to Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2 and (II)GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 3A.3 and 4B.1 of The London Plan 2008.

31

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

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

NOTED

1. An alteration to the proposal to read: Change use to restaurant/café with ancillary takeaway with a maximum seating capacity of 16 people together with an infill extension and extractor flue at rear.
2. Receipt of an additional objection from Southgate Green Association.
3. The advice of Planning officers that litter concerns were covered by Condition 1, and that advertisements would require separate consent, so the local planning authority would retain control.
4. The deputation of Mrs Susan Reynolds, local resident, including:
 - (i) A cafe with 16 covers and therefore small seating allocation would be likely to concentrate on the takeaway side of the business, leading to concerns about littering, traffic congestion and problematic parking.
 - (ii) There were no speed humps or cameras on Meadway and many families in the road had concerns about extra traffic.
5. The statement of Councillor Edward Smith, Southgate Ward Councillor, including:
 - (i) A large number of residents in Meadway had objections to the proposal; a petition in opposition included 70 signatures.
 - (ii) He and the residents disagreed with officers' conclusions.
 - (iii) This shopping parade had only six A1 retail premises left out of 16 units, and the loss of another shop should be resisted. There were already three food outlets in the parade, and many more nearby in Southgate and Southgate Green.
 - (iv) The amenity and character of Southgate Green conservation area would be unduly affected by this predominantly takeaway usage.
 - (v) The cafe location was unsuitable as there were parking restrictions and very limited parking locally, and the entrance to Meadway was narrow.
6. The response of Mr A. Diplos, the agent, including:
 - (i) The premises would only be open 8.30 to 19:30, and would be closed on Sundays.
 - (ii) The custom of students and families would be targeted; the cafe would provide babychanging facilities, and also cater for disabled people.
 - (iii) 60% of sales were expected to be takeaway, including breakfasts, soup and sandwiches.
 - (iv) The refreshments planned would not result in odours.
 - (v) The premises was already a gift and flower shop and it was unlikely this change of use would affect traffic or parking.
7. The Planning officer's confirmation that the application had been made on the basis of predominantly cafe use (A3), with takeaway as an ancillary part of that, and that conditions had been drafted accordingly.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

8. Members' concerns in relation to information in the agent's statement regarding the high percentage of takeaway business, and that the application should not be determined until further details were available.
9. Members' and Dennis Stacey's concerns regarding takeaway use in the conservation area, and Councillor Hall's request that officers investigate potential reasons that permission may be refused.

AGREED that consideration of the application be deferred to enable further consideration regarding the extent of takeaway from the use.

32

TP/08/0386 - MAYFIELD ATHLETIC CLUB, KENMARE GARDENS, LONDON, N13 5DR

NOTED

1. The deputation of Mrs Deirdre Quinn, local resident of Ulster Gardens, including:
 - (i) 88% of the residents in the three affected roads had signed a petition objecting to the application.
 - (ii) The tennis club currently had a negative impact in the area, which would be made worse by this proposal. More visitors would increase the traffic and parking problems, and there would be additional noise.
 - (iii) Local residents were disappointed that the club made no effort to communicate or consult them on the plans.
 - (iv) Loss of the conifer hedge would result in loss of privacy to residents and more exposure to floodlighting and noise pollution, and impact on wildlife. New shrubs would take time to become established.
 - (v) More development of this small site would lead to over-intensification of use.
 - (vi) The proposal would cause loss of residential amenity and impact on neighbours' privacy and tranquility.
2. The response of Ms Juliet Clark, on behalf of Mayfield Athletic Club, including:
 - (i) The tennis club was very successful, with around 120 members and nine tennis teams, but a comparatively small junior section. The club therefore wished to offer junior players a facility with a porous macadam surface to practice and learn tennis.
 - (ii) Provision of a full size court would also help to accommodate the numbers of members who wished to play, to enable more matches to be played and provide a facility for coaching.
 - (iii) The club was a local amenity with a large percentage of members living within 10 minutes' walking distance.
 - (iv) She apologised for the lack of consultation with local residents, which had not been deliberate.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

(v) It was not expected that the proposal would generate much additional traffic, as the facility would accommodate existing members and juniors, who would not be attending at peak times, and there would not be significant extra noise.

(vi) It would be necessary to remove some of the conifer hedge, but there would be a well managed planting scheme with much more amenity value.

3. In response to Members' queries, the advice of the Planning officer in relation to replacement planting, and confirmation that the present hedge was not covered by any planning condition, or worthy of a tree preservation order.

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

33

AD/08/0039 - SLOPERS POND FARM, STAGG HILL, HADLEY WOOD, BARNET, EN4 0PX

AGREED that advertisement consent be granted, subject to the condition set out in the report.

34

TP/06/2287/REN1 - 751, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 3SA

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

35

TP/08/0153 - 324, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 5TT

NOTED

1. An amendment to Condition 2, to clarify it did not relate to takeaway deliveries.
2. Members' concerns in relation to refuse storage, and that officers should be satisfied as to its security and adequacy.
3. Councillor Simon's request for inclusion of a requirement to provide a litter bin in the vicinity of the premises.

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

Condition 2:

Deliveries to (excluding those connected with the take away function of the use), and refuse collections from the premises shall only take place between

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Saturday, with none on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties.

Additional Condition:

Prior to the opening of the hot food take away premises hereby approved, agreement shall have been entered into to secure the provision of an additional litter bin outside the premises or if more appropriate, elsewhere within the vicinity, in accordance with detail to be agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to reduce litter and improve the appearance and quality of the residential environment.

36

TP/08/0155 - 870 GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 2RS

NOTED an amendment to Condition 2 following discussions with the applicant, regarding extension to opening hours.

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

Condition 2:

The premises shall only be open for business between the hours of 09:00 – 18:00 Monday to Saturday and 10:00 to 16:00 on Sundays. All activity associated with the use shall cease within one hour of the closing time specified above.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby residential properties.

37

TP/08/0475 - TILE KILN FARM, BURNT FARM RIDE, ENFIELD, EN2 9DY

NOTED

1. Receipt of a letter of comment from the Environment Agency, with an objection that a flood risk assessment had not been submitted for the site.
2. A consequent amendment to the recommendation, that the decision be delegated to officers, subject to satisfactory resolution of the concerns of the Environment Agency.
3. Councillor Simon's request that officers also consider any other legal reasons why permission may not be granted.

AGREED that the decision be delegated to officers following the receipt of a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21.5.2008

38

TP/08/0360 - 143, MANDEVILLE ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 6SQ

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

39

LBE/08/0001 - PRINCE OF WALES PRIMARY SCHOOL, SALISBURY ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 6HG

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

40

TOWN PLANNING APPEALS

NOTED the appeal information in the agenda pack.

All business of Planning Committee thus being concluded, the meeting ended at 9.00 pm.

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2008/09 REPORT NO. **31**

Final Created: Author: Dept:

COMMITTEE:

CONSERVATION ADVISORY
GROUP
14TH May 2008

PLANNING
26TH June 2008

-

AGENDA – PART 1	ITEM 5
SUBJECT -	
ENFIELD DESIGN AWARDS 2007	
WARDS: ALL	

REPORT OF:

Director of Place Shaping and Enterprise

Contact Officer: Christine White
Tel: 020 8379 3852 or
Email: christine.white@enfield.gov.uk

1. SUMMARY

1.1 The report is for Members' information and is a review of the Enfield Design Awards (EDA) 2007. The awards were organised and promoted by the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) and facilitated by the Council's planning staff. The event was sponsored by The Enfield Society and supported by the Enfield Gazette who publicised the awards. The next EDA is proposed for 2009.

2. RECOMMENDATION

2.1 That the review of the Enfield Design Awards 2007 be noted and the proposals for the Enfield Design Awards 2009 be noted.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Enfield Design Awards (EDA) is a biennial scheme promoted by the CAG in partnership with the Council. The Scheme encourages a wider awareness of good design in the built environment and the positive impact it can have on everybody's life.

3.2 The scheme was delivered working closely with community partners such as The Enfield Society, who sponsored the 2007 Awards. The EDA continues to be supported by the Enfield Gazette who, along with the Council's own publications, spread awareness of the Awards to a borough wide audience.

3.3 The EDA 2007 was the third time the scheme has been run by the Council and the quality of the entries and the growing support that the event has attracted has clearly shown the success of the scheme.

3.4 The Awards were open to any scheme completed between 2005 and 2007, visible to the public and located anywhere in the borough. Nomination forms were made available through the press and on the Enfield Council website. The EDA team also had a stand at the Enfield Town Show in Autumn 2006 to encourage people to nominate the borough's best new building.

The entry criteria embraced most of the building types found in the borough. The Award categories for 2007 were: -

- New Residential Development
- Commercial development,
- Community Building or Project
- Listed Building or heritage project

3.6 This year 31 entries were received in respect of the four Award categories. The EDA Sub Group short-listed fourteen schemes, which were visited by the judging panel in December 2007.

3.7 The judging panel reflected a wide range of opinion, age and skill. The judges for 2007 were :-

- Wendy Taylor, CBE - Artist
- Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group
- Paul Campbell – Urban Designer, Design for London
- Councillor Tony Dey, Council Member – Borough Heritage Champion
- Jon Finney, Past Chairman – London Branch Institute of Historic Building Conservation, Chairman - London and Middlesex Archaeological Society
- Leon Bicknell, Architect – Bicknell Associates

3.8 The entries were assessed on design theme, visual quality, impact and contribution to Enfield's built environment. In total the panel awarded three winners, four highly commended and six commendations across the categories. An additional award, the Chairman's Commendation was given in recognition of a special project not fitting into a main category. Appendix 1 sets out details of the category winners and a list of all those schemes that received an award.

4. AWARDS CEREMONY

4.1 The Awards were presented by the Mayor of the London Borough of Enfield at a special awards ceremony held at the Civic Centre on 24th January 2008. There were over 110 guests in attendance. An exhibition of all the

short listed entries was displayed. A number of new features were introduced to the Awards this year, such as a keynote presentation by Paul Campbell of Design for London, thereby strengthening the borough's links with other regional design organisations. Dennis Stacey the Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Group hosted the occasion and the Mayor, Councillor Don Delman presented the awards.

5. BUDGET

5.1 The budget for the Enfield Design Awards 2007 was £4,000 and was met from existing resources. In addition £1,500 sponsorship was secured from the Enfield Society which helped meet the increased costs of products and services and the growth and enhancement of the Awards scheme as a tool in encouraging everyone involved in development in Enfield to strive for design excellence.

5.2 The main areas of expenditure were: -

- Stationery (e.g. judges packs, award certificates, promotional leaflets)
- Judging Day (e.g. transportation)
- Winners Plaques
- Exhibition
- Equipment hire
- Awards ceremony (e.g. catering)
- Awards Brochure

5.3 Costs have been kept to a minimum by considerable input from the voluntary sector, the use of Planning staff and in house services and compared to our research of budgets for such events in other boroughs we believe, reflects good value for money.

Background Papers

File PL43 Enfield Design Awards

APPENDIX 1

New residential development

- Winner – 1-39 Pellipar Close, N13 (sheltered accommodation)
- Highly Commended – Edmonton Green, N9 (mixed development)
- Commended – Zest, 432-434 Church Street, N9 (private development of flats)
- Commended – 2B Barrowell Green, N21 (private development of flats).

Commercial Development

- Winner – Myddelton House (Abercrombie Building), Bulls Cross (office)

Community building or project

- Winner – Lea valley High School, Bullsmoor Lane, Enfield
- Highly Commended – Bus terminus, Edmonton Green, N9
- Commended - Civic Facilities building, Cecil Road, Enfield
- Commended – St George's Car Park, Edmonton Green.

Listed building or heritage project

- Highly commended – Myddelton House, Bulls Cross (disabled access and restoration of gates and railings)
- Highly Commended - Whitewebbs Transport Museum, Whitewebbs Road
- Commended - Borough fingerposts (restoration)
- Commended – 387-405 Fore Street, N9 (Heritage Economic Regeneration Scheme)

Chairman's Commendation

The Word Wall, Palace Exchange, Enfield.

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2008/2009 - REPORT NO. 30

COMMITTEE:
PLANNING COMMITTEE
26.06.2008

AGENDA - PART 1	ITEM 6
-----------------	--------

SUBJECT -

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

REPORT OF:
Interim Borough Planning
Officer

Contact Officer:
David Snell Tel: 020 8379 3838
Andy Higham Tel: 020 8379 3848

6.1 APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH UNDER DELEGATED POWERS INF

6.1.1 In accordance with delegated powers, 305 applications were determined between 07/05/2008 and 10/06/2008, of which 243 were granted and 62 refused.

6.1.2 A Schedule of Decisions is available in the Members' Library.

Background Papers

To be found on files indicated in Schedule.

6.2 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS TO DISPLAY ADVERTISEMENTS DEC

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 Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
- (2) Other background papers are those contained within the file, the reference number of which is given in the heading to each application.

6.3 APPEAL INFORMATION

INF

The Schedule attached to the report lists information on town planning application appeals received between 01/05/2008 and 05/06/2008 and also contains information on decisions taken during this period.

LIST OF APPLICATIONS
TO BE DETERMINED
BY THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
ON: 26TH JUNE 2008

APPLICATION: LBE/08/0003 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Edmonton Green

Location: Derby Road, Off KENNINGHALL ROAD, LONDON, N18 2PE

PAGE No: 22

APPLICATION: TP/06/2368/REN1 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Winchmore Hill

Location: 875, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 2QS

PAGE No: 28

APPLICATION: TP/08/0165 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Southgate

Location: 42, HIGH STREET, LONDON, N14 6EB

PAGE No: 33

APPLICATION: TP/08/0205 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Bowes

Location: 111, TOTTENHALL ROAD, LONDON, N13 6JA

PAGE No: 41

APPLICATION: TP/08/0534 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Southgate Green

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

PAGE No: 46

APPLICATION: TP/08/0596 RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Bowes

Location: 70-74, Forest House, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 6BE

PAGE No: 51

APPLICATION: TP/08/0804

RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Edmonton Green

Location: PUBLIC HOUSE, 56, VICTORIA ROAD, LONDON, N9 9SU

PAGE No: 58

APPLICATION: TP/08/0982

RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Lower Edmonton

Location: ST EDMUNDS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON,
N9 7HJ

PAGE No: 72

APPLICATION: TP/08/0551


RECOMMENDATION: Approval Subject to
Conditions

WARD: Grange

Location: 19, 21 And 23, Waverley Road, Enfield, EN2 7BP

PAGE No: 76

LBE/08/0003



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 535067 E 192434 N

Application Number: LBE/08/0003

Ward: Edmonton Green

Date of Registration: 2nd May 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: Derby Road, Off KENNINGHALL ROAD, LONDON, N18 2PE

Proposal: Use of site for contractors storage / vehicle storage yard.

Applicant Name & Address:

London Borough of Enfield
P.O.Box 51, Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
EN1 3XB

Agent Name & Address:

Mr R. F. Sample, London Borough of Enfield
Corporate Asset Mgt-Estates & Valuation
P O Box 50
Civic Centre
Silver Street
Enfield
Middlesex
EN1 3XB

Recommendation: That planning permission be deemed to be **GRANTED** in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town & Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to the following condition(s):

1. There shall be no raising of existing ground levels on the site.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding due to impedance of flood flows and reduction of flood storage capacity.

2. The access to Kenninghall Road (marked B on the approved plan) shall be permanently closed. No development shall commence until details of the closure and associated reinstatement works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to first use of the site and the access shall remain closed thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic within the public highway.

3. C12 Details of Parking/Turning Facilities
4. C19 Details of Refuse Storage
5. C31 Open Storage - Height Restriction

6. C49 Restricted Use Class
7. This permission is granted for a limited period expiring on 26th June 2011 when the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the land reinstated.

Reason: To protect the supply of industrial land within the Borough and the objectives of the forthcoming Central Leaside Area Action Plan.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located to the south of Derby Road adjacent to the junction with Kenninghall Road. It comprises a large area of hard standing with points of access from both Derby Road and Kenninghall Road, although the latter does not appear to be in active use.

The surrounding area is characterised by a predominantly residential development to the west and industrial to the east. The site is located within the Primary Industrial Area and within Flood Zone 3. It is also located within the area covered by the Central Leaside Area Action Plan.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the use of the site approx. 1,150 sq.m in size, as a contractors and vehicle storage yard, operating on a 24 hours per day 7 days per week basis. Exact staffing levels will not be known until a tenant for the site is found.

Relevant Planning Decisions

TP/89/1501 Use of site as winter quarters for four showmans caravans from 1st November 1989 to 31st March 1990, granted October 1989.

Consultation

Public

Consultation letters have been issued to 4 neighbouring properties. Any replies received will be reported at the meeting.

External: none

Internal

Any response from the Assistant Director of Community Protection will be reported at the meeting.

Relevant Policies

London Plan (2008)

- | | |
|-------|-----------------------------|
| 3B.1 | Developing London's economy |
| 3B.4 | Industrial Locations |
| 3C.23 | Parking Strategy |
| 4A.12 | Flooding |
| 4A.13 | Flood risk management |

- 4A.19 Improving air quality
- 4A.20 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
- Annex 4 Parking standards

Unitary Development Plan

- (I)GD1 Regard to Surroundings / Integrated into Local Community
- (I)GD2 Quality of Life and Visual Amenity
- (II)GD3 Character / Design
- (II)GD6 Traffic Generation
- (II)GD8 Site Access and Servicing
- (II)GD12 Development in Areas at Risk from Flooding
- (II)GD13 Increased Risk of Flooding downstream
- (II)T13 Creation or improvement of accesses
- (I)EN6 Minimise the environmental impact of all developments
- (II)EN30 Land, air, noise and water pollution
- (I)E1 Enfield as a Location for Business
- (I)E2 Enhance, bring into use and retain employment uses
- (I)E4 Most efficient use of employment land
- (I)EN6 Minimise Environmental Impact of Developments
- (II)E2 Concentrate B1 – B8 uses within Primary Industrial Areas
- (II)E9 Non-Commercial and Industrial Uses
- (II)E15 Noise generated by industrial and warehousing development

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the Core Strategy which will set out the long term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

The Council is now considering the responses received in connection with its consultation on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

- SO3 Protect and enhance Enfield's environmental quality;
- SO17 Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment
- SO21 Sustainable Transport
- CP1 Sustainable and Efficient Land Use
- CP2 Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP3 Flooding
- CP5 Air, Water, Noise and Light Pollution and Contaminated Land
- CP17 Scale and Location of Employment Activities
- CP18 Promoting Economic Prosperity and Developing Skills and Employment Opportunities
- CP29 Promoting sustainable transport and improving access for people with restricted mobility
- CP31 Walking and Cycling

Other Material Considerations

- PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Communities

PPG4	Industrial, commercial development and small firms
PPG13	Transport
PPS23	Pollution control
PPG24	Noise
PPS25	Flood Risk

Analysis

Principle

The use of the site for storage purposes in connection with a contractors yard which is akin to B8 Storage use, would be consistent with the prevailing industrial character of the immediately adjacent land and with Policy (II)E2 that seeks to concentrate B1, B2 and B8 uses within Primary Industrial Areas. As such, it is considered that in principle, the use of the site would be acceptable, subject to the detail considerations below, considered acceptable.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

The nearest residential properties are located to the north on Rays Road with the rear of these dwellings some 70 metres from the application site. Whilst the southern boundary of the rear gardens would be only 45 metres away, the intervening land is occupied by Conduit Lane, which is a busy road providing access to and from the North Circular and used by industrial and heavy goods vehicles. Whilst the proposed use would operated 24 hours per day 7 days per week, it is considered the size of the site would limit the level of activity it could generate. In addition, it is considered that the proposal would be sufficiently distant from these properties to not result in a detrimental impact on their amenities through an increase in noise and general disturbance.

On the opposite side of Kenninghall Road is Kenninghall Open Space. This is a substantial area of public amenity space available to the local community. However, it is noted that the most actively used areas are further away from the existing industrial uses. As such, having regard to the existing industrial context and the scale of the proposed use, it is considered it would not affect the amenities of the users of Kenninghall Open Space. .

The properties immediately surrounding in site are industrial uses and as such it is not considered the proposal will result in an adverse impact on these properties.

Parking and Access

In the absence of a future occupier being identified, there is no specific information regarding the nature of the use and likely traffic flows. Nevertheless, the site is accessible from Derby Road on to Montague Road and Conduit Lane and thereafter, onto the North Circular Road and the North South Route. This good access to the existing highways network and the limited size of the site, means traffic movements will not affect traffic flows on these important routes or conditions of general highway safety.

Concern does exist regarding the use of the existing access to the site from Kenninghall Road is not designed for use by large vehicles. It is noted that this access does not appear to be in active use and as a result , a condition is proposed requiring that the access from Kenninghall Road be permanently closer in favour of the existing access from Derby Road. In addition, a condition is also recommended to require details of the internal parking and turning arrangements to ensure the operation of the site does not affect access or highway safety.

Other Matters

The surrounding area is currently the focus of wider regeneration proposals through the preparation of the Central Leaside Area Action Plan which places the site and the immediate locality within a much more comprehensive framework. As such, it is considered that it would be appropriate to grant planning permission only on a temporary basis to ensure the contribution of this site to any long regeneration objectives are not prejudiced. The Central Leaside Area Action Plan is presently due to be adopted June 2010 and a temporary period of 3 years is therefore appropriate.


The site is located with Flood Zone 3, within the 1 in 100 flood risk event. As such, a condition is proposed requiring there to be no raising of site levels to ensure the proposal does not adversely affect on or off site flood storage.

Conclusion

In the light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed be approved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed use of the site as a contractors / vehicles storage yard for a temporary period of 3 years would retain land within a Primary Industrial Area within employment use having regard to policies (I)E1, (I)E2, (I)E4, and (II)E2 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as policies 3B.1 and 3B.4 of the London Plan (2008) and the objectives of PPS1 and PPG4.
2. The proposed use of the site as a contractors / vehicles storage yard for a temporary period of 3 years would not detract from the character or visual amenities of the surrounding area or unduly affect the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential or industrial properties having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2, (II)GD3, (I)EN6, (II)EN30 and (II)E15 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as the objectives of PPS1, PPS3, PPG4 and PPG24.
3. The proposed use of the site as a contractors / vehicles storage yard for a temporary period of 3 years would not give rise to unacceptable on street parking, congestion or highway safety issues, having regard to Policies (II)GD6, (II)GD8 and (II)T13 as well as Policy 3C.23 of the London Plan and the objectives of PPG13.
4. The proposed use of the site as a contractors / vehicles storage yard for a temporary period of 3 years would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding or create an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere, having regard to Unitary Development Plan policies (II)GD12 and (II)GD13, as well as policies 4A.12 and 4A.13 of the London Plan 2008 and the objectives of PPS25.

TP/06/2368/REN1



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 531989 E 194615 N

Application Number: TP/06/2368/REN1 **Ward:** Winchmore Hill

Date of Registration: 20th March 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: 875, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N21 2QS

Proposal: Renewal of time limited permission granted under ref. TP/06/2368 for the use of the ground floor as a sandwich bar with seating area.

Applicant Name & Address:

Hayriye Uzmaner, Cafe Riva
875, GREEN LANES
LONDON
N21 2QS

Agent Name & Address:

Hayriye Uzmaner, Cafe Riva
875, GREEN LANES
LONDON
N21 2QS

Note for Members

Although an application of this nature would normally be dealt with under delegated authority, this application seeks renewal of a planning permission originally granted by the Planning Committee on a temporary basis and thus, it is reported here to enable the Committee to consider the grant of a permanent planning permission.

Recommendation: That planning permission is **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. No hot food shall be prepared or consumed on the premises at any time in connection with the approved use of the ground floor of the premises(875 Green Lanes) as a sandwich bar with ancillary seating.

Reason : In order to prevent the introduction of food sales or a use that would detract from the retail character/ or viability of the local shopping centre as well as the residential amenities of neighbouring and nearby residential properties, having regard to the policies of the Council.

2. The premises shall only be open for business between the hours of 07.30-18.00 hours 7 days a week, and all activity associated with the use shall cease within 1 hour of the closing time specified above.

Reason: To ensure the use of the premises contributes to the retail function and character of the Local shopping Centre and avoids any further harm arising too its vitality and viability and to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby residential properties.

3. Details of refuse storage facilities including facilities for recycling of waste to be provided within the development as well as the provision of a litterbin outside the premises have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason : In the interests of amenity and the recycling of waste materials in support of the Boroughs waste reduction targets and to prevent any increase in litter which would act to the detriment of the appearance of the centre.

Site And Surroundings

The site comprises the ground floor unit of the premises which is currently operating as Café Riva. The upper floor contains residential accommodation. The site is located on the western side of Green Lanes within Winchmore Hill (Green Dragon Medium Local Centre) and the surrounding area is a mix of retail / commercial and residential uses.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the continued use of the ground floor as a sandwich bar with seating area (mixed A1/A3 use) currently operating as Café Riva which was granted planning permission for a temporary period of 1 year which expired on 29th February 2008. There are seven tables with 14 chairs within the premises. They are currently open between Mondays to Saturday 7.30am – 4pm.

Relevant Planning History

TP/06/2368 - Use of ground floor as sandwich bar with seating area was granted a temporary 1-year permission by the Planning Committee on 27/2/07.

TP/04/0783- Change of use of ground floor from Retail (Class A1) to hot food take away with external flue at rear was refused planning permission in June 2004. An appeal against this decision was dismissed in December 2004.

LDC/01/0143- An application for a Certificate of Lawfulness seeking to establish the lawful use of the premises for purposes within Use Class A3 was refused in September 2001.

Consultations

Public

Consultation letters were sent to 14 neighbouring properties. No responses have been received.

External None

Internal None

Relevant Policies

London Plan

2A.9 The suburbs- supporting sustainable communities
3C.23 Parking Strategy
3D.1 Supporting Town Centres
4B.8 Respect Local context and communities

Unitary Development Plan

- (I) GD1 Development to have regard to its surroundings
- (II) GD1 Changes of use appropriately located
- (I) GD2 Development to improve environment & quality of life
- (I) S1 Provision of shopping facilities
- (I) S3 Safeguard vitality and viability of local shopping centres
- (II) S14 Non retail uses within Local centres
- (II) S18 Food and drink uses within shopping centres

Local Development Framework- Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the core strategy, which will set out the long term spatial vision and strategic objectives of the Borough.

The Council is now considering the response received to its consultation on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will increase and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with emerging policy direction for the Borough.

- SO7 Distinctive, balanced and healthier Communities
- SO11 Safer and Stronger communities
- SO16 Preserve the local distinctiveness
- SO 17 Safeguard established communities and quality of the local environment
- CP14 Safer and Stronger Communities

Other Material Considerations

- PPS1- Delivering Sustainable communities
- PPS6 Planning for Town Centres
- PPG13 Transportation

Analysis

Background

Although the former use of the premises was retail within Use Class A1, the applicant's use of the premises was held to fall outside that of a sandwich bar which would also normally be within Use Class A1 due to the level of seating within the premises and the nature of the operation which was that of a café with the majority of trade being for customers who consumed their food or drink on the premises. However, while it was acknowledged the use not within either A1 or A3, the use did serve the local community and may therefore be appropriate within this local retail centre. As a result, the planning permission was limited to a period of 1 year in order for the acceptability of the approved use to be reassessed having regard to its impact on the retail character together with the vitality and viability of the local shopping centre, as well as the residential amenities on neighbouring residential properties.

Impact on the vitality and viability of the Medium Local Centre

The focus is whether the non retail use of the premises has had an adverse affect on the retail character or the vitality and viability of the local centre over the past year.

Whilst there is a high representation of non-A1 uses in the parade between Shrubbery Gardens and Vicars Moor Lane with approximately 46 %, in non retail use as well as a cluster of A3 uses in particular sections, this level of representation has not altered since the previous application was determined. Moreover, the application premises represents a small unit and its contribution to the overall retail character is limited due to its size. It is therefore considered to be suitable for current use as a café / sandwich bar and that the use as a sandwich bar itself has had a positive effect on the vitality and viability of the centre over its year trial period.

Furthermore, we have received no objections from local traders or business groups regarding this application. Accordingly the change of use of the premises to a mixed (A1/A3) use is considered to be acceptable in terms of its contribution to the vitality and viability of this Medium Local Centre or further limit the availability of premises to provide a range of convenience goods to the locality.

Impact on the residential amenities of surrounding properties

It is not considered that that the hours of opening or the operation of the sandwich bar has resulted in any significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of surrounding residents in terms of adverse noise/ smell or disturbance. No adverse comments have been received in this respect during the consultation response nor have colleagues in Environmental Health reported any complaints having been received over the same period. Moreover, the opening hours of 7:30 to 4pm are considered to be reasonable and operation within these hours would not give rise to any harm to residential amenity especially given the position of this property on the heavily trafficked Green Lanes.

Conclusion

Circular 11/95 “ The Use of planning Conditions in planning permissions” advises that a second temporary permission should not normally be granted and that a trial period should be sufficiently long for it to be clear by the end of the first permission whether permanent permission or a refusal is the right answer. Mindful of this advice, it is concluded that continued use of the premises is acceptable having regard to the material planning policy and the circumstances of the premises. It should also be noted that the proposal would be consistent with the Council’s emerging Core Strategy especially in terms of providing distinctive, balanced and healthier communities and to safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment. It is therefore recommended that that planning permission is granted for the following reasons.

1. The change of use of the ground floor of the premises to a sandwich bar with additional seating (A1/A3) subject to imposed conditions, is not considered to adversely impact on the viability of the Winchmore Hill Medium Local shopping Centre having regard to policies (I) S1, (I) S3, (II) S14 and (II) S18 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The change of the ground floor of the premises to a sandwich bar with additional seating having regard to the site’s close proximity to good public transport links is not considered to give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic or additional on street parking problems on the adjoining highway having regard to Policies (II) GD6, London Plan Policy 3.C23 and PPG13.
3. The proposed use of the premises including the proposed opening hours and the absence of any hot food to be cooked/ prepared on the premises, does not give rise to conditions prejudicial to the amenities of local residents or the residential character of the surrounding area having regard to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) S18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

TP/08/0165



Crown Copyright (c) Licence no. LA 086363.
For data accuracy, please see the Data Quality Reports on the 'Start Page'



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 529853 E 193699 N

Application Number: TP/08/0165 **Ward:** Southgate
Date of Registration: 25th January 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: 42, HIGH STREET, LONDON, N14 6EB

Proposal: Change of use to restaurant / cafe (Class A3) with a maximum seating capacity of 16 people together with an infill extension and extractor flue at rear.

Applicant Name & Address:

A Ippocratous
42, HIGH STREET
LONDON
N14 6EB

Agent Name & Address:

A.L Diplos
4A, STATION PARADE
COCKFOSTERS ROAD
BARNET
EN4 0DL

Note for Members

An application of this nature would normally be determined under delegated authority. However, David Burrowes MP has requested, due to the level of public interest regarding the proposals, that the Planning Committee considers this matter. Furthermore, at the meeting of Planning Committee on 21st May 2008, it was resolved to defer consideration of the application to enable officer to obtain clarification of the precise nature of the proposal and whether any take away is involved. Following a meeting with the applicant, it can be confirmed that the proposal is for a café / restaurant within Use Class A3.

Recommendation: That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. C19 Details of Refuse Storage
2. C35 Opening Hours Restriction-Rest/Takeaways
3. C37 Restricted Hours - Deliveries
4. C48 Restricted Use
5. Prior to the opening of the cafe / restaurant hereby approved, agreement shall have been entered into to secure the provision of an additional litter bin outside the premises or if more appropriate, elsewhere within the vicinity, in accordance with details to be agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: in order to reduce litter and improve the appearance and quality of the residential environment.

6. Seating will be provided internally for a maximum of 16 persons. No seating, tables, street furniture or any activity associated with the operation of the use will take place in the rear outside the premises.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and the setting of the Conservation Area.

7. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

The premise is a mid-terrace single-storey shop unit situated within the Southgate Green Conservation Area. The premises is currently in use as a florists within Use Class A1

The premises is situated within a 'Small Local Centre' as designated in the Unitary Development Plan, which comprises no.'s 30 –62 (even) and 27 – 69 (odd) High Street.

The surrounding area fronting the High Street, comprises a mix of retail, commercial and residential uses, with residential properties along The Meadway located to the east of the application site.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the change of use of the premises from a florists (Class A1) to a café/restaurant (Use Class A3). The Agent has confirmed that the premises will operate as a café serving breakfast and lunch snacks and refreshments and will not operate as a hot food take away.

The proposal will seat a maximum of 16 people within the café,. The opening hours of the premises will be from 8:30am until 7:30pm, Monday to Saturday. The existing flower shop employs two members of staff and an additional member would be employed in connection with the proposed use.

In addition to internal alterations, the existing roller shutter door to the rear of the premises will be replaced with a single door with the remaining void bricked up. Furthermore, an extractor flue is proposed to the pitched roof of the rear section of the unit.

No alterations to the existing shop front are proposed as part of this application.

Relevant Planning Decisions

42 High Street : TP/92/1150 - Change of use from retail (A1) to health and beauty salon granted January 1993

30 High Street : TP/89/0060 - Change of use from florist shop (A1 use) to offices for the provision of professional services (A2 use) granted June 1989

32 – 36 High Street : TP/91/1068 - Change of use from retail (A1) to financial and professional services (A2) granted December 1991

40 High Street : TP/92/0083 Change of use from retail shop (A1) to Estate Agents (A2) in connection with no. 38 High Street and involving internal alterations and installation of a new front door granted March 1992

41 High Street : TP/04/1552 - Change of use from retail (Class A1) to Professional / Accountancy service (Class A2) granted September 2004

65 – 69 High Street - TP/04/1422 - Change of use of ground floor from offices to restaurant (class A3) granted December 2004

Consultations

Public

Consultation letters were sent to 18 neighbouring and nearby residential properties in connection with this current application. A total of nine written objections were received, which raised all or some of the following points:

- Increase in noise, traffic, litter, smells, vermin and general disturbance resulting from the proposal.
- Both Southgate Green and Southgate Circus are adequately served by restaurants, cafes and eating establishments.
- There is no capacity for off – street parking in this location which will result in cars parking in inappropriate locations and traffic congestion.
- Cars regularly park on the island adjoining the application site which causes congestion along this stretch of the road.
- The existing florists shop provides a community service.
- The surrounding houses on the Meadway are charming and full of character, the extractor flue at the rear would be out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- The proposal would be out of keeping with the Conservation Area.

Petition

A petition containing 70 signatures objecting to the proposed change of use on the above grounds, was also received

Internal

Environmental Health raises no objection.

External

Southgate District Civic Trust comment that “The Group have no objections to this application for a change of use to restaurant/café, although in this position, there is a problem with parking at the best of times. A seating capacity of 16 persons is quite sufficient, and they would not wish it to have takeaway facilities unless there was a way of making sure that the kind of litter accompanying takeaways would be dealt with by the owners in a prompt and regular manner. The existing shop has a subdued coloured frontage and painting the shop front white may not look right in the street scene of the Meadway. If this application is granted, future requests for pavement usage, which usually follows, would of course require a license, and we would expect to be consulted at this time as to its suitability in this position”.

Thames Water raises no objection subject to condition regarding the installation of a fat trap to prevent fats, oils and grease being disposed of into the sewerage system.

Relevant Policy

London Plan (2008)

2A.9	The Suburbs – supporting sustainable communities
3C.1	Integrating transport and development
3C.23	Parking strategy
4A.18	Water and Sewerage Infrastructure
4B.8	Respect Local Context and Communities
4B.12	Heritage Conservation

Unitary Development Plan

(I) GD1	Development to have regard to its surroundings
(I) GD2	To seek to ensure that new developments improve the environment
(II) EN30	Noise pollution.
(II) GD3	Aesthetic and functional design
(II) GD6	Traffic generation
(II) GD8	Site access and servicing
(II) S13	The loss of neighbourhood retail units
(II) S14	Change of use to non- retail units within local centres
(II) S18	Food and Drink uses within shopping centres.
(II) C29	Uses within Conservation Areas.

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the Core Strategy which will set out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

In response to consultation in respect of Issues and Options which identified key areas, the Council has now consulted on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy and is now in the process of considering the responses. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will increase and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

SO7	Distinctive, balanced, and healthier communities
SO11	Safer and stronger communities
SO16	Preserve the local distinctiveness
SO17	Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment
CP1	Sustainable and Efficient Land Use
CP5	Air, Water, Noise and Light Pollution and Contaminated Land
CP14	Safer and stronger communities
CP29	Promoting sustainable transport and improving access for people with restricted mobility

Other Material Considerations

PPS1	Delivering Sustainable Communities
PPS6	Planning for Town Centres
PPG15	Planning and the Historic Environment

Southgate Green Conservation Area Appraisal

Analysis

Use

The Agent has confirmed that the premises will operate as a café serving breakfast and lunch snacks and refreshments together with hot drinks, sandwiches and ice creams and will not operate as a hot food take away. Operation as a hot food takes away would constitute a material change of use and require formal planning permission.

Under the auspices of a café use, it is possible for there to be a small element of sale of food and drink for consumption off the premises though the Agent has confirmed that this is not the purpose of the intended use. If it were to occur, the level of activity would need to be assessed as part of a future investigation to establish any harm and identify the need for any enforcement action. However, the proposal has to be assessed on the basis of the proposal as submitted, not what might occur in the future and according the proposal is assessed on the basis of a change of use to a café within Use Class A3 not involving take away.

Loss of Retail

The property is situated within a 'Small Local Centre' as designated within the Unitary Development Plan, comprising the no.'s 30 –62 (even) and 27 – 69 (odd) High Street. A recent survey has revealed that within the centre, the breakdown of premises is as follows:

Use Class	No. of Units	% of Units	% of units should the proposal be allowed
A1 (Retail)	6	37%	31%
A2 (Financial and Professional Services)	4	25%	25%
A3/A4/A5 (Food and Drink)	3	19%	25%
Sui generis	2	13%	13%
Vacant	1	6%	6%

As can be seen, the level of retail within the parade at 37% is well below the 65% threshold used within town centre to indicate appropriate levels of retail representation and associated vitality and viability. However, this figure is not directly applicable to local shopping centres but clearly, the level of retail is relatively low. As a result, it is considered that the centre does not have a distinct retail function or character especially as there is a relatively high proportion of financial and professional service uses immediately adjoining the application site including an Estate Agents, a Solicitors office and a Hairdressers. This is probably due to the close proximity of Southgate Circus, which fulfills local shopping needs.

As a consequence of the mix and the lack of any established retail character, although the proposal would lead to a further fall in the level of A1 representation to 31%, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable. Moreover, it is noted that planning permission has previously been granted for the establishment of appropriate non-retail uses in the parade

It is acknowledged that many of the objections received have raised concerns over the sufficient provision and over-concentration of food and drink uses already within the vicinity. The survey of the local centre reveals that there are a number of existing food and drink uses within the local centre equating to 19% of the current mix and increasing to 25% with the implementation of the proposal. Having regard to their disposition, it is considered that this would not constitute an over-concentration or unacceptable grouping within the context of this local centre, with the overall

provision of financial and professional services showing a similar level of concentration. Furthermore, it is also acknowledged that there are a number of food and drink uses falling just outside the shopping centre and when considering the proposal in the light of the centre itself and within the wider context of the surrounding area, it should be recognised that the existing food and drink uses demonstrate a good balance across the A3/A4/A5 classification, with public houses, restaurants and cafes. On balance therefore, the proposed change of use is considered acceptable on retail policy grounds .

Impact on adjoining residential amenities and the character of surrounding area

There are residential premises situated in close proximity to the application site, to either side on the High Street and to the rear along The Meadway. Objections to this application have been received from residents from many of the surrounding residential streets including the High Street, Meadway and Bourne Avenue. Impact on the amenities of local residents could possibly arise from an increase in noise, disturbance and general activity as well as increases in litter and odours

The Applicant has indicated that the premises would operate predominantly as a café serving light breakfasts, soups, small lunches, salads, ice cream, teas, coffees and light refreshments, catering for local people, parents with children and, students. Opening hours for the proposed cafe are 8:30 – 19:30 Monday to Saturday and these reflect the opening hours normally associated with retailing activity. The absence of evening opening beyond 7.30pm removes the potential effects on the amenities of neighbouring and nearby residential properties in terms of noise, disturbance and increased activity that can sometimes be associated with this type of use. A condition is therefore recommended to cover the opening hours and restrict the use to a café / restaurant.

In terms of the odour, an extract flue is shown to the rear of the premises. Immediately to the rear is a commercial premises beyond which is 70 The Meadway. This is the nearest property and is sited approximately, 12 metres from the extract duct. It is considered this separation is sufficient to offset any adverse effect on amenity. In addition, Environmental Health in raising no objection request the imposition of a condition to ensure that adequate ventilation is provided in order to limit potential odours, and that secure refuse containers are provided for commercial waste.

Impact on the Conservation Area

The premises are located in the Southgate Green Conservation Area. The Character Appraisal identifies the premises forming the crescent at the entrance to the Meadway including the application site, as “landmark building”, positively contributing to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Mindful of this, the proposed use would not in itself, harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It is also noted that no alterations area proposed to the existing shop front, which will ensure the external appearance and thus their “land mark “ quality is safeguarded.

With regard to the external flue at the rear of the premises, this would project approx 350 mm above the ridgeline of the rear section of the premises which is lower than the height of the main building. As a result of its size and siting, it has minimal visual presence and thus will not have any detrimental impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area,

Parking / Access

High Street is a heavily trafficked route linking Southgate in the north with the North Circular Road in the south and along this section, it is relatively narrow. Consequently, there are parking

restrictions in the form of single yellow lines along this stretch of the High Street and along the adjoining junction with The Meadway. The Meadway itself, is subject to a residents parking scheme.

The Public Transport Accessibility level in this location is level 3, representing a comparatively high level of public transport access in an area well served by bus routes and with the tube station at Southgate a short walk away to the north.


Overall, given the existing parking restrictions, it is considered that the proposal will not generate a level of traffic to cause any significant congestion at the junction of The Meadway or on the adjoining highways or give rise to conditions prejudicial to driver or pedestrian safety through on street parking. is reinforced by the absence of on street parking due to existing parking controls.

Conclusion

In the light of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable for the following reasons:

1. The proposed change of use from use class A1 to a café / restaurant would not harm the composition or viability of the small local centre in which it is situated having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (II)GD1, (II)S13, (II)S14 of the Unitary Development Plan
2. The proposed change of use from use class A1 to a café / restaurant would not unduly affect the amenities of adjoining occupiers, or the character of the Palmers Green town centre as a whole having regard to Policy (II)GD1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The proposed change of use from use class A1 to a café / restaurant would not unduly affect the setting of the Southgate Green Conservation Area, having regard to Policy (II)C29 of the Unitary Development Plan.
4. The proposed change of use from use class A1 to a café / restaurant would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways having regard to Policies (II) GD6 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 3C.23 of the London Plan.

TP/08/0205



Crown Copyright (c) Licence no. LA 086363.
For data accuracy, please see the Data Quality Reports on the 'Start Page'



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 531387 E 191984 N

Application Number: TP/08/0205 **Ward:** Bowes
Date of Registration: 20th February 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: 111, TOTTENHALL ROAD, LONDON, N13 6JA

Proposal: Conversion of a single family dwelling into 2 self-contained flats (1x1 bed and 1x2 bed) and rear dormer window (RETROSPECTIVE).

Applicant Name & Address:

Mehmed Hassan Behjet
111, TOTTENHALL ROAD
LONDON
N13 6JA

Agent Name & Address:

Recommendation: That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. C19 Details of Refuse Storage
2. C25 No additional Fenestration

Site and Surroundings

This is a mid terrace property with an existing rear dormer. The property is situated in a residential area composed predominantly of terraced dwellings, interspersed with small blocks of purpose built flats and maisonettes. Green Lanes is located approximately 400 metres to the west of the application site, and comprises a mix of commercial retail and residential uses.

Amplification of Proposal

Permission is sought to continue the use of the property as two self-contained flats comprising a one bedroom unit at ground floor and a two bedroom unit at first floor and within the converted roof space, together with the retention of a rear dormer.

Relevant Planning History

TP/87/0924 - Conversion of house into 2 self-contained flats was refused planning permission in December 1987.

Consultations

Public:

Consultation letters have been sent to 7 neighbouring properties. Although no response was received from the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, a letter of objection has been received from Wolves Lane and District Residents Association, who raise the following concerns:

- A large number of single family dwellings have already been converted within the vicinity, altering the character of the area dramatically and unnecessarily limiting the number of single family dwellings available.
- Allowing this application will destroy the character of an area many residents have always enjoyed as family orientated.
- Local infrastructure is currently unable to fully support the needs of current residents.
- Traffic problems within the area are rife, specifically with regard to this road. -Allowing this application will exacerbate the existing traffic, parking and noise nuisance.

External: None

Internal: None

Relevant Policy

London Plan

3A.1	Increasing London's supply of housing
3A.2	Borough housing targets
3A.4	Efficient use of stock
3A.5	Housing choice
3C.23	Parking Strategy
4B.8	Respect local context and communities
Annex 4	Parking Standards

UDP Policies

(I) GD1	Regard to surroundings
(I) GD2	Development to improve the environment
(II) GD6	Traffic generation
(II) H8	Privacy
(II) H9	Amenity space
(II) H16	Flat Conversions

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the Core Strategy which will set out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

The Council is now considering the responses to the consultation on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

SO7	Distinctive, balanced, and healthier communities
SO11	Safer and stronger communities
SO16	Preserve the local distinctiveness
SO17	Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment
CP1	Sustainable and Efficient Land Use
CP5	Air, Water, Noise and Light Pollution and Contaminated Land

CP14 Safer and stronger communities

CP29 Promoting sustainable transport and improving access for people with restricted mobility

Other Material Considerations:

Supplementary Planning Guidance on flat conversions

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Communities

PPS 3 Housing

PPG13 Transportation

Analysis

With regard to flat conversions, the key issues are the relationship to the existing character of the area, the adequacy of the internal layout, the effect on the amenities of the area and neighbouring occupiers and the effect on parking and the free flow and safety of traffic.

Relationship to Existing Character

Policy (II)H16 of the Unitary Development Plan seeks to ensure that the number of flat conversions in a particular street does not exceed 20% to avoid any unacceptable change to the established character of an area. A survey has been undertaken of Tottenhall Road and this shows that a total of 24 of the 218 original single family dwellings have been converted into flats: this represents 11%, of the total which is below the 20% threshold. Furthermore, a closer look at the immediate surrounding area, and the properties between the junctions with Fairbrook Road and Melville Gardens reveals that there are only five converted properties within this stretch of 55 properties, representing 9% of the total.

When assessing the effect on the existing character, the total number of flats conversions is only an indicator and regard must also be had to the grouping and overall spatial relationship of the converted properties. The nearest property already converted into flats is No.70 situated opposite the application site with those at Nos 73 and 131 being the closest to either side. Furthermore, the conversion of the property has not resulted in a significant external alteration which harms its setting within the street scene. Taking this spacing and external appearance into account, it is considered that the existence of this flat does not result in an over concentration of converted properties that due to general activity, acts to the detriment of the existing character or overall residential amenity through increased noise, general disturbance and activity.

Adequacy of Accommodation

Policy (II)H16 also identifies that planning permission will not normally be granted for the conversion of properties where the internal floor area of the original property is less than 90m². The existing property has an internal floor area exceeding 130m², and thus, the property is appropriate for conversion. Furthermore, Supplementary Planning Guidance recommends that in the case of 1 and 2 bedroom flats, that the minimum net internal floor space of the converted accommodation should be 45m², and 57m² respectively. In this case, the floor areas of the units are 56 sq.m for the ground floor 1 bedroom unit and 66 sq.m for the two bedroom first floor unit. Moreover, both units have an acceptable internal layout and thus, provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation.

It is accepted that access to the rear garden is only available to the ground floor flat but this is not uncommon in residential conversions and public open space is available approximately 600 metres west of the application site, for the occupiers of the first floor flat.

Car Parking

No off-street parking provision is currently available or achievable in this instance, as the properties have limited depth of front garden. The property is situated in an area with a PTAL rating of 3, which indicates reasonable access to public transport due to the proximity of Green Lanes and the numerous bus routes that run along that road. There is limited on street parking available in the road, which approaches saturation levels during evening and weekend periods. However it is considered capacity does exist to accommodate any parking associated with the occupation of these flats without harming issues of safety or the free flow of traffic or the amenities of local residents. Especially as the parking generated by the former three bedroom house compared with the two flats is not dissimilar.

Policy (II)GD6 of the Unitary Development Plan states the need to have regard to the traffic likely to be generated by a development. However, given that the conversion is from a two or three bedroom house, into a 1 x one bed flat and 1 x two bed flat, the development is unlikely to generate a significant increase in traffic, therefore the impact of the proposal on traffic generation is deemed to be acceptable.

Rear Dormer Window

The rear dormer window measures 5 metres in width, 1.2 metres high and is sited 400mm below the ridge line and 1 metre above eaves with a further 500mm to the edge of the roof.. As a result, the dormer is considered to be of an appropriate size within the roof plane and does not represent a visually discordant feature detrimental to the appearance of the property or the appearance of the wider area

Conclusion

In light of the above, the proposal is considered acceptable having regard to applicable policy and the site circumstances. It would also be consistent with strategic objectives in the emerging Core Strategy especially in terms of creating distinctive and balanced communities whilst safeguarding established communities and the quality of the local environment.. It is recommended therefore that planning permission is granted for the following reasons:

1. The proposed conversion of the single family dwelling into 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 2 bed self contained units provides an acceptable level of accommodation and does not unduly detract from the residential character and amenities of the surrounding area and in particular, the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, in keeping with Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2, (II)GD3, (II)H15 and (II)H16 (Appendix A1.9) of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed conversion of the dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3 bed self contained units would contribute to increasing the borough's housing stock, having regard to London Plan Policies 3A.1 and 3A.2.
3. The proposed conversion of the single family dwelling into 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 2 bed self contained units would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways having regard to Policies (II)GD6 and advice contained within PPG 13 (Transport).
4. The rear dormer, due to its design, size, and siting within the rear roof plane, does not detract from the visual amenities of the surrounding area or the amenities of neighbouring residential properties having regard to Policies (II)GD3 and (II)H15 of the Unitary Development Plan.

TP/08/0534



Crown Copyright (c) Licence no. LA 086363.
For data accuracy, please see the Data Quality Reports on the 'Start Page'



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 529083 E 192218 N

Application Number: TP/08/0534 **Ward:** Southgate Green

Date of Registration: 4th April 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

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

Proposal: Extension to provide office and reception area to the west of the main hall.

Applicant Name & Address:

Mrs K Khwaji, Head Teacher
GARFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD ROAD
LONDON
N11 1RR

Agent Name & Address:

Kevin Ellerbeck, KSE Building Services
69, Northaw Road East
Cuffley
Herts
EN6 4LY

Recommendation: That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. C08 Materials to Match
2. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

The school occupies land to the west of Palmer's Road bounded by Springfield Road to the north and Upper Park Road to the south. The main access to the site, and main school entrance is via Springfield Road. The main school complex comprises a series of linked, predominantly single storey buildings formed around the central school hall.

The immediate surrounding area is residential in character, with more mixed commercial and retail uses along Bowes Road to the north, Station Road to the west and the North Circular to the east. Arnos Grove Tube Station is located approximately 350 metres to the north east of the site, and New Southgate railway station a similar distance to the west.

The site is not situated in a conservation area or immediately adjacent to any listed buildings.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension infilling an area to the west of the school hall, projecting 10 metres forward from the existing school entrance, and connecting to the existing block to the west, which currently accommodates the school office and staff room. The extension is to be constructed with a flat roof at a height of 2.7 metres.

The proposed extension will comprise a new main entrance, and reception area, in addition to staff office space and WC.

Relevant Planning Decisions

LBE/05/0020 - Demolition of existing nursery and erection of a single storey extension incorporating a new glazed canopy over the front entrance and covered areas to provide a children's centre for 54 children (aged between 2-4 years) together with the conversion of existing toilets to provide a community facility and provision of an external storage container and relocation of existing climbing frame received permission in October 2005

LBE/96/0023 - Erection of a 2-storey building to provide eight junior classrooms, together with provision of associated car parking spaces, involving removal of existing two double and one single temporary classroom units, and erection of a fence to a maximum height of 3m to new car park between junior playground and quiet play area (Phase II) received permission in November 1996

LBE/96/0018 - Formation of new Tarmac playground, together with construction of a vehicular access to Springfield Road received permission in November 1996

LBE/96/0002 - Erection of an infill extension to part of existing school building to provide furniture store received permission in April 1996

Consultations

Public

Consultation letters were sent to 147 neighbouring properties. No objections have been received.

Internal: None

External: None

Relevant Policy

London Plan

3A.24 Education facilities
4B.8 Respect local context and communities

Unitary Development Plan

(I) GD1 Development to have regard to its surroundings
(I) GD2 To seek to ensure that new developments improve the environment
(II) GD3 Aesthetic and functional design
(II) GD6 Traffic generation
(II) GD8 Site access and servicing
(II) CS2 Siting and design of community service buildings
(II) CS3 Community service buildings provided at optimum locations

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related

documents will be the Core Strategy which will set out the long term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

The Council is now considering the responses it has received in connection with the consultation on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

- SO7 Distinctive, balanced, and healthier communities
- SO11 Safer and stronger communities
- SO17 Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment
- CP1 Sustainable and Efficient Land Use
- CP5 Air, Water, Noise and Light Pollution and Contaminated Land
- CP14 Safer and stronger communities
- CP29 Promoting sustainable transport and improving access for people with restricted mobility

Relevant National Planning Policy / Guidance:

- PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Communities
- PPG13 Transport

Analysis

The proposed extension will provide a new front entrance leading directly to the new reception area, rather than the main body of the school thereby facilitating improved security. The remaining floorspace within the extension will be occupied by staff office space and WC, which are suitable uses ancillary to the operation of the school.

It is not considered that the new entrance arrangements will have any adverse impact on the residential amenity of adjoining residential occupiers through increased noise and disturbance or associated vehicle movements.

Visual impact

The proposed building due to its design, scale and siting away from the boundary will have no significant impact on the appearance or character of the surrounding area, or the residential visual amenities of adjoining occupiers.

Moreover, sited immediately adjacent to the main school hall and adjoining buildings which are of a similar height and scale, the extension is consistent with the scale and design of adjoining school buildings and will not therefore detract from the appearance of the wider school site.

Parking / Access

The extension will not affect the existing access off Springfield Road, or the parking provision in the adjoining staff and visitor car park. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal will have no detrimental impact on the free flow of traffic on Springfield Road or any adjoining highway or on vehicular or pedestrian safety.

The proposed extension will also facilitate improved access to an existing ramp entrance will provide for disabled access to the building.

Conclusion

It is considered that having regard to the above, that the proposal is acceptable having regard to applicable policy and would also be consistent with the strategic objections for the emerging Core Strategy especially in terms of contributing towards safer and stronger communities. It is therefore recommended that the proposal should be granted for the following reasons:

1 The proposed extension due to its size and siting does not unduly affect the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential properties, the appearance of the street scene or the character of the surrounding area, having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2 and (II)GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposal provides improved additional space to be used in conjunction with and supportive of the existing school use in accordance with Policies (II)CS2 and (II)CS3 of the Unitary Development Plan, and Policy 3A.24 of the London Plan.

3 The proposed proposal does not unacceptably prejudice the provision of on site parking, nor does it give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways having regard to Policies (II)GD6, of the Unitary Development Plan and PPG13.

TP/08/0596



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 531024 E 192022 N

Application Number: TP/08/0596 **Ward:** Bowes
Date of Registration: 17th March 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: 70-74, Forest House, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 6BE

Proposal: Erection of 2nd and 3rd floor extensions (third and fourth storeys) to provide 8 self contained flats (comprising , 3 x 2 Bed, 2 x 1 Bed and 3 x studios)a mansard roof at 3rd floor level and 5 off street parking spaces.

Applicant Name & Address:

Mr Michael Georgiou, Bracton Ltd
70-74, GREEN LANES
LONDON
N13 6BE

Agent Name & Address:

Mr Graham Fisher
1, Woodlands Avenue
Wanstead
London
E11 3RA

Note for Members

Although the application involves development that could normally be determined under delegated authority, Councillor Georgiou has requested that the Planning Committee consider the application due to the concerns of local residents. It is also noted that Planning Committee. Determined the previous application relating to this proposed development.

Recommendation: That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. C08 Materials to Match
2. C19 Details of Refuse Storage
3. C25 No additional Fenestration
4. C24 Obscured Glazing
5. C26 Restriction of Use of Extension Roofs
6. Prior to the occupation of the flats the parking spaces indicated on drawing 178/38C (received on 19th May 2008 shall be provided and made available for use and there after retained in perpetuity.

Reason : In order to ensure the satisfactory provision and retention of the adequate parking spaces for the development.

7. Prior to the occupation of the flats the existing gate across the site access off Princess Avenue shall be removed, and no new gate or obstruction to this access shall be installed

within 4.8m of the site boundary to Princess Avenue.

Reason : To ensure that vehicles can readily enter the site without blocking the adjoining footway, prejudicial to highway safety.

8. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

The application site consists of a two storey flat roof building (Forest House) which is occupied as a hostel (21 bedrooms on two floors), which is situated on the junction of Green Lanes (A1050) with Princess Avenue: a residential road composing of two storey terraced properties. No 1 Princess Avenue is separated from the hostel by an access drive. Immediately to the north of the hostel stands Clock House Mansions, which is a three storey building. It should be noted that there is a three/ four storey building on the south side of Princess Road junction with Sydney Avenue.

The premises are located within the defined local shopping centre of Green Lanes and is characterised by a mix of commercial, retail and residential uses.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a 2nd and 3rd floor (third and fourth storey) to Forest House to provide 8 self-contained flats comprising 3 x 2 bed units, 2 x 1 bed and 3 studios.

Externally, the development would be designed with a mansard at the 3rd floor level with a cornet turret feature and vertical bay feature to the Green Lanes frontage. The second floor would be finished in painted render.

A total of five car parking spaces would be available for all occupiers of the resultant building, one of which would be used for the hostel manager with the remaining four parking spaces for the 8 new flats. Access to the parking spaces would be from Princess Avenue adjacent to 1 Princess Avenue. The two newly created parking spaces would be on an area of vacant land within the applicants ownership approximately 10metres to the north of the existing 70-74 Green Lanes site. The applicants have also submitted in a transport assessment in support of the application.

Relevant Planning History

TP/07/1740- an application proposing the construction of 2nd and 3rd floors to provide 4 additional flats and 205m² of office space was refused by the Planning Committee in December 2007. The reason for refusal related to the fact that the proposed development due to the configuration, siting and access arrangements for the parking, having regard to the cumulative impact of the uses contained within the resultant building would give rise to on street parking conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on Princess Avenue as well as the residential amenities of local residents contrary to policy (I) GD1, (I) GD2, (II) GD6 and (II) GD8 of the UDP and policies 3c.22 and 4B.7 of the London Plan. This application is currently the subject of an appeal.

TP/06/0070- an application for the construction of 2nd and 3rd floors to provide 4 self-contained flats and offices was refused in July 2006 on the grounds relating to bulk/ massing in the street scene and lack of sufficient car parking. An appeal against this was dismissed in May 2007 but solely on the ground that the Inspector considered that the additional on street parking generated would give rise to Congestion in the surrounding streets disrupting the free flow of traffic to the detriment of highway safety contrary to policies (II) GD6 and (II) GD7.

TP/05/0466- an application for the construction of a mansard roof to provide 4 self-contained flats was approved in May 2005. Although the permission remains valid, it has not been implemented.

Consultations

Public

Consultation letters were sent to 41 neighbouring properties. Two letters of objection was received raising the following points:

- loss of light to property
- totally unacceptable increase in vehicles attempting to park
- existing parking already over stretched and at saturation point, this will make things worse
- represent overcrowding of an already overdeveloped site
- cause overlooking of adjacent buildings
- access to parking will pass the only pedestrian access to Clockhouse Parade / Clockhouse Mansions and in view of the narrowness of the driveway is undesirable

External None

Internal None

Relevant Policy

London Plan

- 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing
- 3A.2 Borough Housing targets
- 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- 3C.23 Parking Strategy
- 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- 4B.8 Respect local context and communities
- 2A.1 Sustainability criteria

UDP Policies

- (I) GD1 Appropriate regard to surroundings
- (I) GD2 Improve environment, quality of life and visual amenity
- (II) GD1 New development and uses appropriately located
- (II) GD3 High standard of functional and aesthetic design
- (II) H8 Privacy
- (II) H9 Amenity space
- (II) GD6 Traffic generation
- (II) GD8 Site access and servicing

Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the core Strategy which will set out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives of the Borough.

The Council has now consulted on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy and is in the process of reviewing the responses received. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will increase and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which the development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

SO11 Safer and stronger communities

SO16 Preserve the local distinctiveness

SO17 Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment

CP1 Sustainable and Efficient Land Use

Other Policy considerations

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3 Housing

PPG 13 Transport

Analysis

Background

The application needs to be viewed in the context of the previous planning applications.

Planning permission for 4 self-contained flats with a mansard roof, which in essence created a third, storey/ second floor to the building, was approved under Ref TP/05/0466. This permission at present remains unimplemented but is still valid. The approval did not provide any off street car parking in respect of this application.

A further application TP/06/0770 was then submitted for the addition of a second and third floor (third and fourth storey to the existing building). This development envisaged four self-contained flats on the second floor and 205 sqm of office floor space on the third floor. Planning permission was refused and dismissed on appeal. In so doing, the Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not harm the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. However, the Inspector was concerned that the existing hostel use, the flats and offices would cumulatively generate more vehicle movements than the parking spaces available on site and consequently, the proposal would generate additional kerb side parking and give rise to congestion in the surrounding streets disrupting the free flow of traffic to the detriment of highway safety. He also concluded that it would be unreasonable to control the situation with on street parking controls.

In response to this appeal decision, another planning application was then submitted for the second and third floors (third & fourth storeys) This again envisaged four self-contained flats on the second floor and 205 sqm of office floorspace on the third floor but differed from the previous application in that it included two additional parking spaces on neighbouring land. However, after consideration, the decision of the Committee was to refuse planning permission for the following reason " The proposed development due to the configuration, siting and access arrangements for the parking, having regard to the cumulative impact of the uses contained within the resultant building, would give rise to on street parking and conditions prejudicial to the free flow of traffic on Princess Avenue as well as the residential amenities of local residents. This would be contrary to Policy (I) GD1, (I) GD2 (II) GD6 and (II) GD8 of the Unitary Development Plan and policies 3C.22 and 4B.7 of the London Plan.

The current application again involves the provision of a second and third floor (third and fourth storey) with mansard roof but the application now proposes a purely residential scheme involving

a total of 8 self contained flats ,4 on the second floor and 4 on the third floor rather than the mix of flats and offices proposed in application TP/07/1740.

Impact on proposed parking and Traffic generation

The site is situated in a sustainable location close to the junction of Green Lanes with the North circular (A406) and is well served by public transport with a PTAL rating of 4. However it is acknowledged that the surrounding roads within the immediate vicinity including Princess Avenue are heavily parked with few if any spaces available.

This latest application now provides a more detailed parking layout plan for the development. In total 5 spaces are indicated for the entire use of the site (1 space for the hostel manager and 4 spaces for the flats). Two of the new spaces would be created on an area of land within the ownership of the applicant located approximately 10m to the north of the existing building. The two parking spaces to the north are of an adequate width and depth to satisfactorily accommodate two vehicles. Landscaping of the two parking spaces is also proposed which together with the provision of security lighting and CCTV, will improve their attractiveness and encourage use. In addition, the existing access gates currently sited adjacent to Princess Avenue are to be removed and a new gate relocated 6m further back in the site so as to allow better access in to the site without the need for vehicles to wait on the carriageway while the gates open.

Whilst noting the concern of the Inspector regarding the cumulative impact of the uses on the parking conditions for the surrounding streets, weight must also be given to the planning permission for four self-contained flats (ref TP/05/0566), which remains extant but did not involve any additional parking in connection with the 4 additional flats. The absence of any additional parking provision was considered acceptable because of the highly accessible and sustainable location. In light of this approach, it is considered that additional car parking can only be sought in respect of the balance of the extra 4 flats now envisaged. The proposal provides for four parking spaces for the flats, which given the sites good PTAL rating and sustainable location is considered acceptable. The overall layout of the parking spaces and access to them is considered acceptable on balance. Consequently, it is considered the parking provision and layout are acceptable and will not give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highway.

Impact on character and appearance of the area

The scale of the development in terms of the provision of a 2nd and 3rd floor extension with mansard roof together with its external appearance is identical to that of an earlier appeal considered under application Ref TP/06/0770. When assessing the appeal on this ground, the Inspector concluded that in “ terms of height, the proposal would not look out of place when viewed along Green Lanes from the north and south and whilst the juxtaposition with Clock House Parade Mansions is a little uneasy, it would not significantly detract from the street scene. He also considered that varying roof heights and designs are characteristic of traditional commercial areas along the main road frontages and that the proposed turret would provide a landmark feature with the repetition of the existing front elevation at second and third floor level completing the appearance of the building.

Moreover, whilst he acknowledged that there would be a change in height between the proposed development and two storey dwellings on Princess Avenue any difference would be reduced by the proposed development.

The current application involves no alteration to the external scale or appearance of the proposed and in light of the Inspectors conclusions; it is considered the proposed development would have an acceptable appearance within the street scene.

Impact on the amenities of surrounding residents

In considering the previous scheme and the relationship to the nearest residential property i.e. 1 Princess Avenue, the Inspector concluded that subject to a condition requiring the use of obscure glazing where appropriate, the development would not cause any significant loss of privacy to the occupiers of 1 Princess Avenue or the occupiers of Clock House Mansions. Furthermore, the Inspector was also satisfied that the development would not give rise to any material loss of light, overshadowing or loss of outlook to neighbouring properties.


The only difference in this latest scheme compared with the earlier appeal is that the 3rd floor is now residential rather than office accommodation. Subject to appropriate conditions regarding obscure glazing where necessary which address any potential increase in overlooking from the introduction of habitable accommodation, it is considered that the proposal would not impact on the residential amenities of nearby properties.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed development due to the inclusion of the residential accommodation instead of the office floor space and the revision to the parking arrangements, addresses the previous reason for refusal and is acceptable having regard to the applicable policy. In addition, it should also be noted that the proposal would be consistent with the objectives of the Council's emerging Core Strategy in particular, safeguarding established communities and the quality of the local environment. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted for the following reasons:

1. The proposed construction of a 2nd and 3rd floor extension to provide 8 self contained flats by virtue of its siting, design and appearance would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene or surrounding area having regard to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan
2. The proposed development due to its size, siting and design would not adversely impact on the residential amenities or loss of privacy to surrounding properties having regard to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The proposed development would contribute to increasing the Borough housing stock as well as the range and mix of accommodation having regard to London Plan Policies 3A.1 and 3A.2.
4. The proposed development, subject to a condition securing the retention of the parking spaces in perpetuity for this development, due to its highly accessible and sustainable shaping centre location would not adversely impact on the on street parking situation or the act to the detriment of the free flow and safety of traffic on the highways having regard to Policies (II) GD6, (II) GD8, London Plan Policy 3C.23 (Parking strategy) and Planning Policy Guidance Note 13.

TP/08/0804



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 533962 E 192802 N

Application Number: TP/08/0804 **Ward:** Edmonton Green

Date of Registration: 17th April 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: PUBLIC HOUSE, 56, VICTORIA ROAD, LONDON, N9 9SU

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 2, part 3, part 4-storey block comprising doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units above (5 x 1-bed, 8 x 2-bed) with basement car parking, vehicular accesses to Victoria Road and Park Road and realignment of the footway (revised scheme).

Applicant Name & Address:

Dr Ali Demirbag, International Property Developments
7, PRINCESSA COURT
76, UVEDALE ROAD
ENFIELD
EN2 6HG

Agent Name & Address:

Ahmet Huseyin, AH Architects
89, Wellington Road
Enfield
EN1 2PL

Recommendation: That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. No development shall take place until details of the solar water heating system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The system shall be installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any of the facilities or flats hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure both an acceptable appearance and that the development contributes to the sustainability objectives of the London Plan (2008).

2. During the period of development, until final completion, no noisy works shall be undertaken on the site outside the following hours:

Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00

Saturday 08.00 to 13.00

At no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays

Reason: To ensure the proposed development does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of nearby premises during its development.

3. Before the development is commenced details of measures to ensure that noise from external sources (transport and industrial) is controlled should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. This should be in the form of a report and have regard to PPG 24 and BS4142. The insulation and building design to be adopted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The measures proposed shall be implemented in accordance with the approved detail before the building is occupied or use commences.

Reason: To ensure the external noise does not prejudice the amenities of occupiers of the premises

4. The development shall not commence until details of measures to ensure that amplified sound generated from plant and machinery (ie: air conditioning units) on/within the premises have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be provided in accordance with the approved detail before the premises are occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the use of the premises does not prejudice the amenities of the public or the occupiers of nearby premises due to noise pollution.

5. a) Prior to the demolition, refurbishment, alteration and extension, all land and building structures associated with the development, and all structures, installations and services including those located underground shall be adequately surveyed to establish the full extent of asbestos containing materials on site. The survey shall incorporate destructive and or intrusive mechanisms to ensure both visible and non-visible materials with a potential to contain asbestos are included.

b) Proposals for the removal, phasing and supervision of asbestos containing materials, all in accordance with current regulations and approved codes of practice and current industry good practice shall be submitted to and approved by the Health and Safety Executive before work commences. The submission shall be in the form of a detailed method statement clearly identifying all relevant factors in accordance with the above and shall be carried out in accordance with the method statement previously approved by the Health and Safety Executive.

Reason: In the interests of public safety.

6. Suitable facilities and methodology for the control of dust generated during development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The approved facilities and methodology shall be provided prior to the commencement of site works and shall be used and maintained during the construction period.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby premises from dust nuisance during the period of development.

7. The hard standing within the ground level car park shall be marked as a no-parking area, except the areas shown as car parking spaces on the approved plans.

Reason: To ensure vehicles can enter and exit the site in forward gear for highway safety reasons.

8. The site shall be enclosed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which shall include details of an acoustic wall or fence to the boundary with no. 57 Victoria Road. The means of enclosure shall be erected in accordance with the approved detail before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory appearance and safeguard the privacy, amenity and safety of adjoining occupiers and the public and in the interests of highway safety.

9. The doctors surgery, dispensary and beauty salon with ancillary offices shall only be open for business between the hours of 07:00 and 21:00 Monday to Saturday and at no time on

Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby residential properties.

10. Deliveries to the premises shall only take place between the hours of 07:00 and 18:00 Monday to Saturday and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties.

11. The premises shall only be used as a doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon, staff accommodation, meeting rooms and 13 self-contained residential units above and shall not be used for any other purposes.

Reason: To protect the amenities of neighbouring properties and in the interests of highway safety.

12. The development hereby approved shall not commence until such time as a mechanism is in place to:

Dedicate land - made up as footway - to public highway, at the junction of Park Road and Victoria Road;

Ensure works are carried out to reinstate as footway the current access points that have come redundant, prior to the development being occupied;

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

Implement satisfactory new access points into the development prior to occupation.

Reasons:

In order that:

The adjoining footway around the site is of an adequate dimension so as not to prejudice highway safety;

An adequate and safe footway is provided for pedestrians around the site;

On-street parking will not take place in association with the new development beyond the current restricted hours, prejudicial to highway safety or congestion; and

Adequate new access points are constructed.

13. No development shall commence until details of mechanisms to ensure that the street tree adjoining the site is not prejudiced by nearby works liable to affect the tree or its roots have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. These mechanisms shall then be implemented prior to the commencement of development and thereafter maintained.

Reason: To ensure the retention of the highway tree in a safe condition not prejudicial to highway safety.

14. No development shall take place until an assessment has been carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage (SuDS) scheme, in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in national planning policy guidance and statements, and the results of that assessment have been provided to the local planning authority. The assessment shall take into account the design storm period and intensity; methods to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site; and measures to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters.

Reason: To ensure that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding from surface water run-off or create an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere.

15. Surface water drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with details that have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority before the development commences. Those details shall include a programme for implementing the works. Where, in the light of the assessment required by the above condition, the local planning authority conclude that a SuDS scheme should be implemented, details of the works shall specify:

- i) a management and maintenance plan, for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime; and

- ii) the responsibilities of each party for implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation.

Reason: To ensure implementation and adequate maintenance to ensure that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable risk of flooding from surface water run-off or create an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere.

16. No development shall commence until details of a scheme to provide 100% subsidised bus passes 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.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport and to ensure the development does not adversely affect highway safety or the free flow of traffic in the public highway.

17. C07 Details of Materials

18. C09 Details of Hard Surfacing

19. C17 Details of Landscaping

20. C19 Details of Refuse Storage

21. C22 Details of Const. Vehicle Wheel Cleaning

22. C33 Contaminated Land

23. C41 Details of External Lighting

24. The development shall not commence until details of the design of the secure/covered cycle parking spaces shown on the approved plans have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be installed prior to first use of any feasibilities or flats hereby approved and permanently retained for cycle parking.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle parking spaces in line with the Council's adopted standards.

25. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

The application site is located on the east side of Victoria Road at the junction with Park Road. It comprises a large two storey former public house with dormer windows providing rooms in the roof. It is set in a spacious plot with access from Victoria Road adjacent to no. 57 .

The surrounding area is characterised by residential development, predominantly traditional mid-sized terraced dwellings. To the west lies Pymmes Park and to the east is no. 17 Park Road a two-storey building with dormer windows comprising 10 one-bedroom flats operated by 'One Support', which is set back from Park Road with car parking to the front. Fore Street is approx 150 metres to the east.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing public house and the construction of a predominantly three storey building with a central rotunda forming a four-storey element on the corner of Victoria Road and Park Road and a basement level providing car parking and additional accommodation.

The application includes 13 self-contained flats comprising 5 x 1-bed and 8 x 2-bed and a doctors surgery with associated medical beauty salon, laboratory, dispensary, administrative offices and staff accommodation facilities. The proposed medical use has a gross floor area of 1392m² and will employ 11 full time equivalent staff. The proposed surgery facility will be open 0700 to 2100, Monday to Saturday

The existing accesses will be improved to provide access to basement level staff and residential parking and separate visitor parking.

This application is an amended scheme following the previous refusal of planning permission (ref: TP/07/2491). The principle alterations include the removal of the two storey elements adjoining both 57 Victoria Road and 17 Park Road, a reduction in overall height of 0.55 metres, additional meeting rooms to the fourth floor, 3 additional staff and 1 additional visitors parking spaces, additional cycle parking spaces and a Travel Plan including 100% subsidised staff bus passes.

The submitted Design and Access Statement confirms that private patients will take up approximately 60% of the services, with the remaining 40% providing free clinical services through working with PCT's, the NHS and Strategic Health Authorities. These free services will include some paediatric services, general health and dietary advice, research, a range of booklets and training programmes and some sponsored services including consultations, blood tests, x-rays and physiotherapy.

Relevant Planning Decisions

TP/07/2491 Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 2, part 3, part 4-storey block comprising doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units above (4 x 1-bed, 9 x 2-bed) with basement car parking, vehicular accesses to Victoria Road and Park Road and realignment of the footway, refused in March 2008 for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, massing and lack of integration with the adjoining properties would result in the introduction of an overly dominant and visually intrusive form of development detrimental to the rhythm of properties in the street scene, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the visual amenities enjoyed by

neighbouring properties, as well as providing the perception of overdevelopment of the site, contrary to policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2 and (II)GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3.

2. The proposal due to deficiencies in the layout and number of spaces makes inadequate provision for access and parking for the development to ensure that it will not create conditions prejudicial to the safety and free flow of traffic on the neighbouring highways, contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies GD6, GD8, & T13 as well as policy 3C.23 of the London Plan (2008) and the objectives of PPG13.

3. The proposed development due to its size, siting and relationship to adjacent properties, namely, 57 Victoria Road and 17 Park Road, would result in an obtrusive and overly dominant building leading to conditions, through loss of light and outlook, that would adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of these adjacent properties, contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies (I)GD1 and (I)GD2, as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3.

PRE/07/0120 Redevelopment to provide a community medical centre with 14 self-contained residential units above, advice issued September 2007. The advice stated concerns relating to: over-intensive use of the site, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings, amount of traffic, the level of activity within the buildings, the impact on neighbours amenities, impact on the street scene, parking provision and level of amenity space.

Consultation

Public

Consultation letters have been issued to 87 neighbouring properties. The consultation period expired on 9th May 2008 and no objections have been received.

External

Thames Water does not object to the application, but seeks informatives relating to the installation of a non-return waste valve and the minimum water pressure that Thames Water aims to provide.

The Metropolitan Police seeks to ensure that the application adopts the principles and practices of 'Secure by Design' and the physical security requirements contained within the Code for Sustainable Homes. The details go on to state that the surgery should have separate accesses and parking areas than the residential units, designated fire escapes from the surgery accessing the residential lobbies must be protected by CCTV with audible alert during the day and full alarm coverage outside hours and guidance on security measures for the surgery are provided.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) comments that the fire brigade are not satisfied with the proposals as the proposals do not allow for vehicle access to within 45 metres of all points within each dwelling, as per 16.3 of Approved Document B (2006).

Any other responses will be reported at the meeting.

Internal

The Sustainable Communities Team has no objection on economic development grounds noting that the pub has been empty for some time. They comment that the proposal would greatly contribute to the Place Shaping of the area in terms of the carefully considered layout and distinctive design of the buildings.

The Assistant Director of Community Protection does not object to the application subject to conditions relating to contaminated land, noise and the control of demolition and construction activities.

Director of Education, Child Services and Leisure has no objection to the application.

The Director of Housing expresses concern that the mix of the proposed scheme would not reflect the current Housing Needs Assessment, which focuses on the need for larger family sized accommodation and seeks an overall mix of 13% 1 bed, 37% 2 bed, 36% 3 bed and 14% 4 bed units. And that the housing element should be viewed in isolation rather than as part of the overall scheme.

Any response from the Cleansing will be reported at the meeting.

Relevant Policies

London Plan (2008)

3A.1	Increasing Supply of Housing
3A.2	Borough Housing Targets
3A.3	Maximising the potential of sites
3A.5	Housing choice
3A.6	Quality of new housing provision
3A.8	Definition of affordable housing
3A.9	Affordable housing targets
3A.10	Negotiating affordable housing in individual private residential and mixed-use schemes
3A.11	Affordable housing thresholds
3A.18	Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities
3A.20	Health objectives
3A.21	Locations for health care
3A.22	Medical excellence
3C.21	Improving Conditions for Cycling
3C.23	Parking Strategy
4A.3	Sustainable Design and Construction
Annex 4	Parking standards.

Unitary Development Plan

(I)GD1	Regard to Surroundings / Integrated into Local Community
(I)GD2	Quality of Life and Visual Amenity
(II)GD3	Character / Design
(II)GD6	Traffic Generation
(II)GD8	Site Access and Servicing
(II)H6	Range of size and Tenure
(II)H8	Privacy and Overlooking
(II)H9	Amenity Space
(II)T13	Creation or improvement of accesses
(II)T16	Adequate access for pedestrians and disabled persons
(I)CS1	Regard to Community Services
(II)CS1	Range of Services and Facilities
(II)CS2	Liaison with Service Authorities
(I)EN6	Minimise the environmental impact of all developments

(II)EN30 Land, air, noise and water pollution

Local Development Framework - Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the Core Strategy which will set out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

The Council is now considering the responses received in connection with the consultation on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

- SO1 Sustainability and Climate Change
- SO3 Protect and enhance Enfield's environmental quality;
- SO6 High quality, sustainably constructed, new homes to meet the aspirations of local people
- SO7 Distinctive, balanced, and healthier communities
- SO8 Affordable Housing, Family Homes and Social Mix
- SO9 New social facilities
- SO10 Address social deprivation, child poverty and inequalities in health and educational attainment
- SO11 Safer and stronger communities
- SO16 Preserve the local distinctiveness
- SO17 Safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment
- SO21 Sustainable Transport
- CP1 Sustainable and Efficient Land Use
- CP2 Sustainable Design and Construction
- CP5 Air, Water, Noise and Light Pollution and Contaminated Land
- CP10 Managing the Supply and Location of New Housing
- CP11 Affordable Housing
- CP12 Housing Mix
- CP13 Healthcare and wider determinants of health
- CP14 Safer and Stronger communities
- CP29 Promoting sustainable transport and improving access for people with restricted mobility
- CP31 Walking and Cycling

Other Material Considerations

- PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Communities
- PPS3 Housing
- PPG13 Transport

Analysis

Principle

The use of the site for residential and health care purposes is appropriate having regard to the prevailing residential composition of the locality and the proximity to Fore Street. In addition, the mixed-use scheme would increase the supply of housing within the Borough assisting in the attainment of housing targets whilst the health care element would improve the range of

community facilities available. The principle of the proposed development therefore, subject to the detailed considerations below, is considered acceptable.

Character and Appearance of the area

Density

The application proposes 13 flats comprising 5 x 1-bed and 8 x 2-bed thus resulting in a residential density of 200 hrph or 76 u/h. However, the application also includes a 2 bedroom residential unit for staff with a further 3 habitable rooms. Overall therefore, the scheme would have a residential density of 218 hrph or 82 u/h.

In terms of the density matrix contained in the London Plan, it is considered the site lies within an urban area given the areas predominantly dense development e.g. terraced dwellings albeit there are few high density developments, a mix of different uses and typically, buildings of two to four storey in height, located within 800 metres of a District Centre. The site lies within 600 metres of Angel Edmonton district centre. In addition, the site is located within PTAL 3. The density matrix therefore suggests a density of 200 to 450 habitable rooms per hectare. Furthermore, given the predominance of units with more than 3.8 habitable rooms within the vicinity of the site the matrix suggests a unit range of 45 to 120 units per hectare. With this in mind it is considered that 218 hrph and 82 u/h would represent an acceptable density.

It is recognised that the development also contains a significant non-residential element. The density figure therefore, does not give a true indication of scale and the integration of the development with the surrounding area. The question of whether the proposed scheme represents an appropriate form of development and not an overdevelopment of the site, therefore, must involve more than a numerical assessment. It must take into account the relationship of the development to its surroundings and the street scene, as well as its impact on residential amenity to establish acceptability.

Design and Appearance

The scheme provides a modern contemporary design on a prominent corner plot. Whilst this differs from the style and appearance of the remainder of Victoria Road and the existing street scene, it is considered this approach would make a positive contribution to the visual amenities of the area.

Previously, concern had existed due to the siting, overall scale and site coverage of the development and its integration into the street scene and the relationship with the adjoining properties to Victoria Road and Park Road. A key component of this concern related to the limited separation between the buildings, which in turn emphasised the differences in respective ridge and eaves heights, as well as differences in overall building design. Through discussions with the applicant, the footprint of the scheme has been reduced by removing the end two storey elements which adjoined both 57 Victoria Road and 17 Park Road. Their removal provides for substantially improved separation of 5 metres and 5.4 metres from the side boundaries, respectively. It is considered that this space provides for greater separation between the buildings and an improved setting for the currently proposed development in the street scene.

The relationship between the neighbouring buildings is further improved by the reduction in height of by 0.55 metres. This reduces the differential in roof height between no.'s 57 Victoria Road and 17 Park Road to approximately 1.3 metres and only 0.3 metres, respectively. In addition, the horizontal emphasis provided by the variation in materials between the first and second floors will more appropriately line up with the eaves level of no. 57 Victoria Road. The applicant has also

provided an extended street scene elevation and photomontage which illustrate how the proposal will be viewed in relation to Victoria Road and how the alterations have addressed the previous reasons for refusal. Furthermore, whilst the revised scheme does include an additional element of 4 storey adjacent to the rotunda section, these are set back some 5.4 metres from the elevations to both Victoria Road and Park Road, would only be visible from distance views from across the park and their visual impact would be mitigated through the use of predominantly glass materials.

A further consideration regarding the integration of the scheme into the street scene is the appearance of the eastern flank wall when viewed in the context of Park Road. To reduce the prominence of this elevation due to the projection of the development forward of the existing development at 17 Park Road, projecting squared bay feature windows have been included to give visual interest.

Overall, it is considered that the alterations, in conjunction with improved spacing, ensure that the development will adequately integrate with the surrounding properties.

Amenity Space

The scheme includes approximately 500 square metres of amenity space with further landscaping to the frontage of the building. The GIA of the flats is approximately 726 square metres with a further 90 square metres for the staff accommodation. This gives a total of 816 sq.m. The amenity space standard would, therefore, be 539 square metres (75% for 2 bed units and 50% for 1 bed units). Whilst a small proportion of the amenity space would be of limited value due to the siting of vents from the plan room, it is considered the small deficiency (39sq.m) would be offset by the large regular area at the rear of the development and on balance, the amenity space provided is considered adequate for the proposed development to serve the needs of future occupiers and provide an appropriate setting for the development in the street scene.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

Outlook and Privacy

The proposed building projects in front of no. 17 Park Road, a development of 10 residential units, by some 13.2 metres. However, due to reductions in the width of the scheme, there is now 7 metres separation between the buildings. The proposal would still breach a 45-degree line from the nearest window to 17 Park Road by 4.2 metres due to the set back of this adjacent development from Park Road. However, given the overall separation, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact in respect of loss of light or outlook to this property.

With regard to the relationship to 57 Park Road, the proposal is largely aligned with the flank elevation of this property and now provides for approximately 6.5 metres of separation. Whilst there are windows to the flank elevation of this property, these do not serve habitable rooms. It is considered therefore, that the proposal would not have an overbearing impact or result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook to this property.

In respect of privacy, the window design to the flank elevations, and in the case of the northern elevation, the use of obscure glazing, would prevent views back towards 17 Park Road and across to 57 Victoria Road. Views from the 3 and 4 storey rear elevations towards these adjoining properties would either be oblique or at distances of at least 20 and generally over 25 metres. This is considered adequate to avoid any overlooking or loss of privacy. Whilst the proposal would result in 3 and 4 storey development facing the flank elevation and garden to no.

55 Victoria Road and the front elevation of no. 18 Park Road, this would be across a road at distances of at least 17 metres. Again this relationship is considered acceptable.

General noise and disturbance

The visitor parking proposed is located along the boundary with no. 57 Victoria Road. However, this reflects the location of the existing access which serves a larger number of parking spaces. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to an increase in activity or general disturbance along this residential boundary but to safeguard residential amenity, it is considered that an acoustic fence could be erected in this location to screen the noise and a condition is recommended to this effect.

The scheme includes a basement level plant room with outlet vents only 5.4 and 1.3 metres of the private amenity space to no. 57 Victoria Road and 17 Park Road, respectively. The outlets from a plant room in such close proximity to adjoining residential uses have the potential to be intrusively noisy. A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application. However, this covers measures to protect the proposed accommodation from external noise sources. It does not cover noise emanating from the development, in particular the plant room. In principle, following consultation with colleagues in Environmental Health, no objection is raised and a condition seeking details of the noise associated with this plant and machinery is recommended. In this respect, in light of this guidance, it is considered that this matter can be adequately addressed through the imposition of an appropriately worded planning condition.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Provision

As the development involves the provision of over 10 units, there would normally be a requirement to provide affordable housing. This decision is informed through an assessment which seeks to identify whether a development is able to support the provision of affordable housing.

In this instance, the applicant has provided a "Three Dragons" Assessment which demonstrates that the mixed residential / medical scheme proposed generates no financial surplus to provide affordable housing as part of the overall scheme and that if a requirement of affordable housing were to be imposed the scheme would be unviable.

Although Housing considers that affordable housing could be provided on this site this is based on an approach that assesses the residential element in isolation. However, it is considered that the two elements of this scheme: the residential and health care are not separate components but integral to the success of this mixed use scheme. Moreover, weight has been given to the fact that the medical centre has the potential to provide significant community benefits in the locality and the applicant has demonstrated that when the scheme is considered as a whole that there is no surplus available for the provision of affordable housing.

Whilst the desire to maximise the provision of affordable housing is recognised, it is considered that the cross-subsidy from the residential element of the scheme, in lieu of an affordable housing contribution, would be of greater overall benefit to the community. As such, this element of the scheme is considered acceptable and the absence of any affordable housing in this scheme is considered justifiable given the particular circumstances of this case.

Parking and Access

The amended scheme includes 13 residents, 6 staff and 3 visitors parking spaces including 2 disabled spaces and 14, 7 and 4 cycle parking spaces, respectively. A travel plan is also proposed including the provision of 100% subsidised bus passes for staff and a free pick up and drop taxi

service for patients. Having regard to the London Plan standards, the residents and staff parking spaces are considered to be acceptable. The assessment of the level of visitors parking is a more complex process. There are concerns that the proposed 3 visitors parking spaces may not be adequate for the size of facility proposed. On-street parking surveys have been undertaken to assess the potential capacity on the adjoining streets. These indicate an average capacity of 29% or 12.8 available spaces.

Based on the information provided it is suggested that 8 – 14 visitors may be present at the facility at any time, with the peak being towards the end of the day/evening when specialist medical consultants are present. Having regard to the sites PTAL of 3-4, it is reasonable to assume that approximately half of these visitors will not arrive at the site by car. This would result in 4 to 7 cars, with 2 to 4 of those needing to park on-street. Based on the surveys this parking could be accommodated in the surrounding roads; of further assistance is that the peak demand will be later in the day when the surveys showed the highest level of availability. Having regard to the previous use of the site as a Public House, it is considered that these levels of vehicle movements are within the capacity of the surrounding road network.

In respect of access arrangements, both access points are located a sufficient distance from the junction of Victoria Road and Park Road and adequate space is provided for vehicles to enter and exit in a forward gear.

Two separate areas are provided for refuse storage, which are considered to be acceptable. Other servicing is to be via the basement car park. To avoid on street servicing occurring especially around the junction of Park Road and Victoria Road which has the potential to adversely affect highway safety, the applicant has agreed to fund (approx. £4,000-£5,000) improved waiting restrictions around the Victoria Road/Park Road junction and proposed accesses. This will be secured by condition. Further conditions will cover detailed technical aspects of hard surfacing, enclosure, refuse and cycle security.

Other Matters

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LFEPA) has stated concerns regarding the proposal and compliance with the applicable building regulations. Discussions with the Agents have identified the need for dry risers as part of this development and their provision has been agreed in consultation with the LFEPA

Sustainable Design and Construction

The proposal incorporates solar water heating, permeable paving and timber materials from sustainable sources. Details of the solar water heating system will be secured by condition. The proposal scored 75% in the sustainability assessment. It is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the objectives of policy 4A.3 'Sustainable Design and Construction' of the London Plan.

Conclusion

In the light of the above assessment, it is considered that the proposed is acceptable having regard to applicable policy and the site's circumstances. It would also be consistent with strategic objectives in the emerging Core Strategy especially in terms of providing distinctive, balanced and healthier communities, safeguarding local communities and the enhancement of the built environment. It is recommended therefore that the application be granted planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units would contribute to increasing the range and quantity of the Borough's housing stock, as well as providing a facility that would be of benefit to the community having regard to policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2, (II)H6, (I)CS1 and (II)CS1 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies 3A.1, 3A.2, 3A.3, 3A.5, 3A.6, 3A.18, 3A.20, 3A.21 and 3A.22 of the London Plan (2008), as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3
2. The proposed doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units would not detract from the character and appearance or the visual amenities of the surrounding area having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2 and (II)GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3.
3. The proposed doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units would not unduly affect the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential properties having regard to Policies (I)GD1 and (I)GD2 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3.
4. The proposed doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units would not unduly prejudice through overlooking or loss of privacy, the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties, having regard to Policy (II)H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, as well as the objectives of PPS1 and PPS3.
5. The proposed doctors surgery with ancillary offices, dispensary and beauty salon to ground floor, staff accommodation and meeting rooms, and 13 self-contained residential units including the provision of 23 parking spaces and 24 secure cycle spaces would not give rise to unacceptable on street parking, congestion or highway safety issues, having regard to Policies (II)GD6, (II)GD8 and (II)T13 as of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy 3C.23 of the London Plan (2008), as well as the objectives of PPG13.

TP/08/0982



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
London Borough of Enfield.
License No LA086363, 2003

Scale 1/1250 Date 11/6/2008

Centre = 534679 E 194075 N

Application Number: TP/08/0982 **Ward:** Lower Edmonton

Date of Registration: 12th May 2008

Contact: Andy Higham 020 8379 3848

Location: ST EDMUNDS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL, HERTFORD ROAD, LONDON, N9 7HJ

Proposal: Installation of a 3680mm high power coated weld mesh fence to eastern boundary.

Applicant Name & Address:

The Governors
ST EDMUNDS RC PRIMARY SCHOOL
HERTFORD ROAD
LONDON
N9 7HJ

Agent Name & Address:

Mr Stuart Pelan, Wilby & Burnett
Provident House
123, Ashdon Road
Saffron Waldon
Essex
CB10 2AJ

Recommendation: That Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The fence hereby approved shall be coloured green in accordance with a sample to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter, shall be retained in such condition.

Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity.

2. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

St Edmunds RC Primary School comprises of a mixture of two storey and single storey buildings and is bounded by Hertford Road to the west and Bounces Road to the south. To the north and east are residential properties and in particular, Nos 1-25 Kingsmead Avenue: the rear gardens of which abut the eastern boundary.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a new 3m high green-coated weld mesh fence along the eastern boundary of the school. The new fence would stretch for a length of approx 75m from the side boundary of 1 Bounces Road to the rear of numbers 1 to 15 Kings mead Avenue.

At present there is an existing boundary fence along this section which for the most part, is approx 2m in height except for a small section to the rear between 11 to 15 Kingsmead Avenue

where the existing fence is 4m high. There is also a fairly comprehensive tree screen along this boundary.

Relevant Planning Decisions

TP/05/2202 –Removal of existing mobile classroom and erection of a single storey building for use as classrooms, creation of playground area with fence enclosure, new pergola, erection of fencing along western boundary and erection of 2m high fence facing Hertford Road. Application approved January 2007

Consultations

Public

Consultation letters were sent out to 125 neighbours properties. No replies have been received.

External: None

Internal: None

Relevant Policy

London Plan (2008)

4B.8 Respect Local Context and communities

Unitary Development Plan

- (I) GD1 Regard to surroundings
- (I) GD2 Development Improve quality of Life
- (II) GD3 Aesthetic and functional Design

Local Development Framework- Core Strategy preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the core strategy, which will set out the long term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

In response to consultation in respect of Issues and Options, which identified key areas, the Council is now considering its response to the consultation on the Preferred Options for the core strategy. As a policy document, the core strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree which development proposals are consistent with emerging policy direction for the Borough.

- SO11 Safer and stronger communities
- SO16 Preserve the local distinctiveness
- SO17 Safeguard established communities and quality of the local environment
- CP14 Safer and stronger communities

Other Policy Considerations

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Communities

Analysis

The main issue for consideration is the impact of the new fence in terms of its height and appearance, on the residential amenities of adjoining properties Nos 1-25 Kingsmead Avenue

When originally submitted, the proposal involved a 3.86m high blue-coated weld mesh fence. To reduce the visual intrusiveness of the proposed fence which is required in order to improve security for both the school and the adjoining residential properties, the height of the fence has been reduced to 3 metres and the colour changed to green.

The rear gardens of the Kingsmead properties are approximately 16 m in depth with some of the properties having screening on the boundary. It is considered that given the reduction in height of the fencing and more sympathetic colour, the proposal would not affect the residential amenities of the adjacent properties

In addition, whilst the proposed fence would run along the side boundary of 1 Bounces Road, due to a high tree screen on the boundary at this point, the fence would not be visible or it is considered, would it affect the amenities of this property.

With regard to its appearance in the wider area, the main school frontages with Hertford Road and Bounces Road already have 4-metre high fencing and thus, the proposed fencing would not appear as a visually intrusive feature.

Conclusion

In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposal is acceptable having regard to applicable policy and the site circumstances. It is also noted that the proposal would be consistent with objectives in the Council's emerging Core Strategy especially in terms of creating safer and stronger communities and the need to safeguard established communities and the quality of local environments. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted for the following reasons:

1 The proposed new 3m high weald mesh fence on the eastern boundary of the site by virtue of its siting, size, height and appearance would not impact on the residential amenities of adjoining properties having regard to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposed 3 metre high weld mesh fence, due to its siting, size, height and appearance would not detract from the visual amenities of the surrounding area having regard to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan

Application Number: TP/08/0551 **Ward:** Grange

Date of Registration: 1st April 2008

Contact: David Snell 020 8379 3838

Location: 19, 21 And 23, Waverley Road, Enfield, EN2 7BP

Proposal: Redevelopment of site to provide 13 flats (comprising 11 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed) within a 2-storey block, incorporating accommodation at lower ground and roof levels with front and rear dormer windows and rear balconies, together with undercroft access to parking at rear. (Revised scheme)

Applicant Name & Address:

Martin Jewell, Chase Green Developments Ltd
6, Farm Close
Cuffley
Herts
EN6 4RQ

Agent Name & Address:

Mr Martin Jewell, Chase Green Developments Ltd
6, Farm Close
Cuffley
Herts
EN6 4RQ

Recommendation: That Planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. C07 Details of Materials
2. C09 Details of Hard Surfacing
3. C10 Details of Levels
4. C11 Details of Enclosure
5. C12 Details of Parking/Turning Facilities
6. C14 Details of Access and Junction
7. C16 Private Vehicles Only - Parking Areas
8. C17 Details of Landscaping
9. C18 Details of Tree Protection (INSERT REQUIRED)
10. C19 Details of Refuse Storage
11. C21 Construction Servicing Area
12. C22 Details of Const. Vehicle Wheel Cleaning

13. C25 No additional Fenestration

14. C26 Restriction of Use of Extension Roofs

15. The development shall not commence until detailed drawings showing the design of the secure cycle store for the provision of 13 bicycles, including existing and proposed levels, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle store shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

Reason: In the interest of sustainability and the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

16. The development shall not commence until details of a safe a pedestrian route between the car parking area and the site, separate from the vehicle circulation areas, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The route(s) shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans before the development is occupied.

Reason: To provide safe and secure environments for non-motorised movements, in accordance with adopted Policy.

17. C57 Sustainability

18. C51A Time Limited Permission

Site and Surroundings

The application site is on the western side of Waverley Road and comprises of one pair of semis (Nos.19 & 21) and one half of a pair of semis (No.23).

Waverley Road is characterised by a mixture of flats and semi-detached dwellings. Immediately to the north of the proposed site are Nos.15 & 17 Waverley Road, a pair of semi-detached dwellings, and north of this is The Old School House. Immediately to the south of the proposed site is No.25 Waverley Road, which will directly abut the proposed building. Beyond this is Barrydene Court, a 3-storey development.

Amplification of Proposal

Permission is sought for the redevelopment of site to provide 13 flats (comprising 11 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed) within a 2-storey block, incorporating accommodation at lower ground and roof levels with front and rear dormer windows and rear balconies, together with undercroft access to parking at rear. (Revised scheme).

The proposed building will have a maximum width of approximately 25.3m, a maximum depth of 16m, and will have a maximum height of 12.5m.

The ground floor will contain three 2-bed units, with unit 1 separated from units 2 & 3 by the 4.2m wide vehicular access to the carpark at the rear.

The first and second floors will each contain three 2-bed units and one 1-bed unit. The first floor 2-bed units (Nos.4, 5 & 6) will each have access to a rear-facing terrace.

The roof space will contain two 2-bed units and will be served by 4no rear facing dormer windows, one side dormer and one front dormer window.

Parking provision is made for a total of 15 vehicles at the rear of the site accessed via a gated underpass. The carpark will be lower than natural ground level and set behind a log retaining wall and plantings to help mitigate noise disturbance from vehicles to surrounding properties.

Relevant Planning Decisions

Outline planning permission (external appearance, siting, design and means of access) was granted under reference TP/05/1391 for the demolition of the existing buildings (Nos.19-25 Waverley Road) and the redevelopment for 17no 2-bed self-contained residential flats in a three storey building incorporating accommodation in roof with front, rear and side dormer windows.

Planning permission (ref: TP/07/2032) was refused for the redevelopment of the site (Nos.19-23) to provide a 3-storey block of 13 flats (comprising 10 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed) together with undercroft access to parking at rear, rooms in roof involving front and rear dormer windows, first and second floor juliet balconies at front and rear balcony and juliet balcony to first floor at rear. Permission was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its size, design, massing and relationship to the flank boundaries of the site and No.25, Waverley Road, does not have appropriate regard to the immediate surroundings, the streetscene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies (I) GD1, (I) GD2 and (II) GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proximity of the rear parking area to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties would intrusion, noise and general disturbance which would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of those properties, contrary to Policies (I) GD1 and (I) GD2 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The vehicle access from Waverley Road and internal access road is sub standard and fails to provide safe two-way passing of traffic to and from the site and within the scheme. This combined with a cramped and substandard parking layout would lead to unacceptable on-site manoeuvrability and unacceptable reversing, queuing and turning to and from Waverley Road prejudicial to highway safety and free flow traffic. This is contrary to Policies (II) GD6, (II) GD8 and (II) T13 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Consultations

Public

Letters were sent to the occupiers of 113 neighbouring properties in addition to the statutory site and press publicity. Nineteen letters of objection have been received, raising some or all of the following points:

Impact on surroundings

- Waverley Road will not benefit or be improved by the new flats as there are already many flats in the road.
- Loss of semi-detached dwellings and pleasant gardens is detrimental to the street scene.
- Quality of design and visual appearance is inferior to other developments.
- Housing stock in this part of Enfield becoming less varied.
- Demolishing half of a pair of semis and attaching the new building to the remaining half is alien to the character of the road.

- It is a 4-storey building, not a 2-storey building.
- Is the drainage system adequate for 13 flats?

Impact on amenity

- Loss of outlook.
- Overlooking.
- Loss of views.
- Loss of privacy to dwellings opposite and to rear gardens.
- Noise and fumes to users of rear gardens directly adjoining the proposed car park.
- Noise and disturbance during construction.
- Siting of refuse facilities at the front.
- Access will be impeded during construction.

Traffic / vehicular issues

- It is often difficult and hazardous getting in and out of Waverley Road due to cars parking on either side.
- Additional cars associated with new units will exacerbate congestion.
- Yet more traffic will impede traffic flow despite underground parking.
- Internal access road is substandard and will not allow for safe two-way passing.
- Insufficient parking provision within the development.

Other matters

- Damage to No.25 and detrimental effect to elderly occupier of No.25.
- Devaluation of No.25.
- The Council must maximise the amount of planning gain from this development for traffic and other improvements.
- Insignificant changes from previous application.

External

The Metropolitan Police Service advises that the application should adopt the principles of 'Secure by Design' standards.

Thames Water advises that with regards to sewerage and water infrastructures, there are no objections.

Enfield Disablement Association – No comments received.

Internal

Director of Education – No objections as the removal of the 4 semi-detached dwellings has a neutral effect on pupil number generation.

Regeneration Unit – No objections but would like to see a local construction employed.

Relevant Policy

The London Plan (2008)

- Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria
- Policy 3A.1 Increasing London's supply of housing
- Policy 3A.2 Borough housing targets
- Policy 3A.3 Maximising the potential of sites
- Policy 3A.13 Special needs and specialist housing
- Policy 3C.22 Improving conditions for cycling
- Policy 3C.23 Parking strategy
- Policy 4A.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- Policy 4B.8 Respect local context and communities

Unitary Development Plan

- (I)GD1 Regard to surroundings
- (I)GD2 Surroundings and quality of life
- (II)GD3 Aesthetics and functional design
- (II)GD6 Traffic
- (II)GD8 Site access and servicing
- (I)H1 Contribute to strategic housing needs of Greater London
- (II)H6 Range in size and tenure of housing stock
- (II)H8 Privacy
- (II)H9 Amenity Space
- (II)T13 Creation or improvement of an access onto the public highway
- (II)T16 Adequate access for pedestrians and people with disabilities
- (II)T19 Needs and safety of cyclists

Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Preferred Options

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Council to replace the Unitary Development Plan with a Local Development Framework. At the heart of this portfolio of related documents will be the Core Strategy, which will set out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the Borough.

In response to consultation in respect of Issues and Options, which identified key areas, the Council is now consulting on the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. As a policy document, the Core Strategy is at an early stage in its process to adoption and thus, presently, can only be afforded limited weight as a material consideration. As the process continues the weight to be attributed to the Core Strategy will grow and the relevant policies are reported to demonstrate the degree to which development proposals are consistent with the emerging policy direction for the Borough.

Strategic Objective 6: To facilitate the provision of high quality, sustainably constructed, new homes to meet the aspirations of local people

Strategic Objective 16: To preserve the local distinctiveness of the Borough, improve the quality and attractiveness of the urban environment, develop civic pride, and create better places and safer and stronger communities through good urban design;

Strategic Objective 17: To safeguard established communities and the quality of the local environment;

Core Policy 1: Sustainable and efficient land use

Core Policy 2: Sustainable design & construction

Core Policy 5: Air, water, noise and light pollution

Core Policy 10: Managing the supply of new housing and locations for new homes

Core Policy 12: Housing mix

Core Policy 14: Safer & stronger communities

Other Policy considerations

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

PPS3: Housing

PPG13: Transport

Analysis

Principle

In broad terms, the proposal would be consistent with the aim of PPS3, The London Plan and with Policy (I)H1, which seek to contribute to the strategic housing needs of Greater London. Moreover, following from the grant of planning permission (TP/05/1391) for a flat development at 19-25 Waverley Road, and the refusal of planning permission (TP/07/2032) for Nos.19-23 Waverley Road, the main considerations are whether the exclusion of the site at no.25 Waverley Road and the resulting alterations to the proposal on the remainder of the plots at no's 19, 21 & 23 Waverley Road in terms of density, amenity space, general mass, bulk, design, traffic and car parking of the scheme will comply with UDP policies, as well as ensuring that the amenities of

adjoining residents are not adversely affected and that the development is in keeping with the character of existing development in the street scene and the surrounding area.

Impact on Character of Surrounding Area

Density assessments must acknowledge PPS3 and the London Plan, which encourage greater flexibility in the application of policies to promote higher densities, although they must also be appropriate for the area. The site falls within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2, therefore the London Plan suggests that a density of 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph) may be appropriate for this location.

Thirty-eight (38) habitable rooms are proposed on a site with a net area of 0.144775ha, equating to a net density of 263.8hrph. The proposed density level exceeds the suggested level within the London Plan. However, a numerical assessment of density must not be the sole test of acceptability, as weight must also be given to the circumstances of the application site in the light of the proposal.

The existing street scene, particularly on the north side of Waverley Road features a number of 3-storey flat developments. Furthermore a three and a half storey development has already been accepted on the site, although it is important to note that the previously approved scheme included the plot at no. 25 Waverley Road. However this plot is now omitted and the applicant seeks to retain the adjacent property to build immediately off the party wall. The current application retains a 'tiered approach to the rooflines', a concern of the previously refused application (TP/07/2032), however this has been simplified and reduced in height by approximately 0.5m. In addition, detailing on the front and rear elevations has been simplified. It is considered that the current proposal would be more visually acceptable within the street scene and will not appear as an incongruous form of development.

In terms of its alignment and use of materials, the proposal remains largely unaltered and retains many of the characteristics from the scheme of 17 dwellings granted planning permission in February 2006 and the previously refused application for 13 units. Consequently the use of materials is considered to be of an appropriate quality and the alignment is satisfactory having regard to the immediate neighbours and the character and appearance of the wider area.

Amenity space

The amenity space provision for this development should be of an area equal to 75% of the gross internal area (GIA) of the building. Amenity space should also provide a visual setting for the development within the general street scene. The GIA for the proposed development is approximately 929.27sqm and the amenity space provision has been calculated as being approximately 533sqm. The ratio of amenity space is therefore equal to approximately 57%. Whilst this is below the level of amenity normally sought, it is considered to be acceptable for the proposed development, given that it is comparable to the provision of amenity space, in terms of area and visual setting, with similar flat developments in the area.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

The proposed development still represents a significant increase in the size and bulk over the existing semi-detached dwellings although it is reduced in terms of these elements when compared with the approved outline permission.

In terms of loss of light and outlook, the proposed development will not compromise either the 45-degree or 30-degree lines taken from the nearest affected windows on the adjoining properties over the ground and first floors respectively. In addition, the north-south orientation will have little direct impact on the sunlight and daylight received to the occupiers of 17 Waverley Road to the south.

In terms of distancing to other buildings, the Unitary Development Plan requires, with regards to facing windows, a minimum of 22m between 2-storey buildings and 30m between 3-storey buildings. At the rear of the site, there is a minimum distance of 31m to the rear boundary and at the front, a minimum of 30m to the dwellings on the southern side of Waverley Road. The proposal therefore exceeds the minimum standards for distancing, resulting in no significant loss of privacy or overlooking to the adjoining occupiers.

Affordable Housing

As the proposed scheme is for more than 10 units, the applicant must demonstrate whether or not affordable housing unit(s) can be provided. The affordable housing assessment is made via the Three Dragons Toolkit. A toolkit assessment has been submitted and assessed by Council's housing officers. The toolkit has established that this site cannot provide an affordable housing component.

Access / Traffic Generation / Parking

Parking along Waverley Road is at a premium during the day due to commuter parking related to Enfield Chase Station. Furthermore, Waverley Road lies just beyond the Enfield Town CPZ, thereby also adding to the pressure for parking.

It is proposed that 15 vehicular spaces will be provided for the 13 units, providing a ratio of 1.2 spaces per unit. The proposed level of vehicular parking is considered to be acceptable in terms of meeting with London Plan standards, which seeks 1-1.5 spaces per unit.

Whilst the siting of the proposed car park has not altered from the previous refused application, the applicant has attempted to overcome the objections to the parking element of that scheme by positioning it at a lower ground level and providing a log retaining wall and plantings to help mitigate noise disturbance from vehicles to surrounding properties. An appropriate scheme of planting can be achieved by way of a suitably worded condition.

In terms of its layout, the parking scheme allows for sufficient manoeuvring of vehicles within the car park. In addition, the width of the access drive has been increased to enable two vehicles to pass each other. This element of the scheme is considered to have adequately addressed the concerns raised with the earlier scheme and would not now lead to unacceptable reversing, queuing and turning to and from Waverley Road prejudicial to highway safety and free flow traffic.

Sustainable Design & Construction

A sustainability assessment form has been submitted with the application, with a pass mark being achieved.

Conclusions

The proposed development is considered to have adequately addressed the concerns raised with the previously refused scheme. The development is of a form that is considered to be compatible with the surrounding area and designed to have no adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. It is therefore recommended that the application be approved for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development due to its design, does not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene or the surrounding area having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (I)GD2 and (II)GD3 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed development due to its size and siting would not significantly harm the amenities of adjoining or nearby residential properties having regard to Policies (I)GD1, (II)H8 and (II)H12 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The proposed development does not prejudice the provision of on site parking nor would it lead to additional parking and therefore, does not give rise to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways having regard to Policies (II)GD6, (II)GD8 and (II)T13 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy 3C.23 of The London Plan, and with PPG13: Transport.

This page is intentionally left blank

TOWN PLANNING APPEALS

Appeal Information for Period: 01/05/2008 to 05/06/2008

Section 1: New Town Planning Application Appeals

Section 2: Decisions on Town Planning Application Appeals

This page is intentionally left blank

Page 89
SECTION 1
NEW TOWN PLANNING APPLICATION APPEALS

Application No.: LDC/07/0501 Ward:Grange

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 30-May-2008

Location: 29, VILLAGE ROAD, ENFIELD, EN1 2ER

Proposal: Use of the outbuilding as a gym.

Application No.: LDC/08/0049 Ward:Cockfosters

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 02-Jun-2008

Location: Land Rear Of, 10 & 12, Beech Hill, Hadley Wood, EN4 0JP

Proposal: Erection of 1.8m high chain link fencing at rear.

Application No.: TP/07/1677 Ward:Southgate Green

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 06-May-2008

Location: 15, LANGSIDE CRESCENT, LONDON, N14 7DS

Proposal: First floor side extension.

Application No.: TP/07/1716 Ward:Cockfosters

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 14-May-2008

Location: 90, PRINCE GEORGE AVENUE, LONDON, N14 4SP

Proposal: Part single storey, part first floor extension together with a two storey rear extension.

Application No.: TP/07/1739

Ward:Enfield Lock

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 08-May-2008

Location: 385, ORDNANCE ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 6HH

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and vehicular access to Ordnance Road.

Application No.: TP/07/2339

Ward:Grange

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 09-May-2008

Location: 43, HOUNSDEN ROAD, LONDON, N21 1LX

Proposal: Part single, part 2-storey side and rear extension, rear dormer window and first floor front infill extension.

Application No.: TP/08/0014

Ward:Chase

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 28-May-2008

Location: Land adjacent, 448, Baker Street, Enfield, EN1 3QU

Proposal: Erection of a 2-storey end of terrace 2-bed single family dwellinghouse.

Application No.: TP/08/0063

Ward:Bowes

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 01-May-2008

Location: FLAT A, 24, UPSDELL AVENUE, LONDON, N13 6JN

Proposal: Rear conservatory (RETROSPECTIVE).

Application No.: TP/08/0131

Ward:Cockfosters

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 05-Jun-2008

Location: 65 & 67, Kingwell Road, Barnet, EN4 0HZ

Proposal: Demolition of existing houses and erection of 4 houses (Outline application - layout and access).

Application No.: TP/08/0132

Ward:Cockfosters

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 05-Jun-2008

Location: 65 & 67, Kingwell Road, Barnet, EN4 0HZ

Proposal: Demolition of existing houses and erection of 8 houses (Outline application - layout and access).

Application No.: TP/08/0229

Ward:Chase

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 21-May-2008

Location: THE COTTAGE, CATTLEGATE ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 8AZ

Proposal: Two storey extension to existing dwelling to provide a 5 bed single family dwelling and demolition and rebuild of outhouse to provide a double garage.

Application No.: TP/08/0270

Ward:Grange

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 15-May-2008

Location: 56, VERA AVENUE, LONDON, N21 1RL

Proposal: Demolition of existing house and erection of a 2-storey dwelling house with accommodation in roof space, front and rear balconies together with associated vehicular access and parking.

Application No.: TP/08/0272

Ward:Cockfosters

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 13-May-2008

Location: 46, BEECH HILL, BARNET, EN4 0JJ

Proposal: Rear conservatory.

Application No.: TP/08/0415

Ward:Chase

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 21-May-2008

Location: 49, BROWNING ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 0EJ

Proposal: Vehicle access for two parking places and construction of hardstanding to front.

Application No.: TP/08/0448

Ward:Grange

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Received date: 03-Jun-2008

Location: 97, THE CHINE, LONDON, N21 2EG

Proposal: Single storey side extension, first floor front extension with canopy to garage, first floor rear extension and extension to roof to raise ridge height, form gable end to rear and front and a front dormer window (revised scheme).

SECTION 2
DECISIONS ON TOWN PLANNING APPLICATION APPEALS

Application No.: TP/00/0658/VAR2

Ward:Southgate Green

(Delegated - 11-Sep-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 05-Jun-2008

Location: 470-474, Bowes Road, London, N11 1NL

Proposal: Variation of condition 3 of approval granted under ref. TP/00/0658 to allow extension of opening hours as follows: 08.00 to 00.00hrs Sunday to Thursday and 08.00 to 01.00hrs Friday and Saturday.

Application No.: TP/03/2030/VAR1

Ward:Grange

(Delegated - 05-Oct-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Allowed

Decision Date: 08-May-2008

Location: 109-111, CECIL ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 6TR

Proposal: Variation of condition 21 of Ref:TP/00/0977, condition 10 of Ref:TP/00/0977/7 and condition 09 of Ref:TP/03/2030 to allow extension of delivery times to 0700 - 1900 hours Mondays to Saturdays and 0800 - 1800 hours on Sundays for Unit LSU3.

Application No.: TP/05/0413/VAR1

Ward:Winchmore Hill

(Delegated - 20-Sep-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 05-Jun-2008

Location: 22, WADES HILL, LONDON, N21 1BG

Proposal: Variation of condition 07 of approval granted under ref. TP/05/0413 to allow the three units to comprise 2 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed self contained flat.

Application No.: TP/06/0789

Ward:Highlands

(Planning Committee - 30-Nov-2006 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Inquiry

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 08-May-2008

Location: CHASE FARM HOSPITAL, (TRUST HQ SITE) THE RIDGEWAY, ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX, EN2 8JR

Proposal: Redevelopment of site B for residential purposes for the erection of a total of 279 units consisting of 164 residential units (comprising 87 two bed flats, 46 three bed houses, 31 four bed houses) and 115 affordable units (comprising 24 one bed keyworker flats, 65 two bed keyworkers flats, and 26 three bed keyworker flats) with associated parking and highway improvement works at junction of Hunters Way and Lavender Hill (Outline Application - siting and means of access only).

Application No.: TP/07/0440

Ward:Palmers Green

(Delegated - 16-May-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 30-May-2008

Location: 20, BARROWELL GREEN, LONDON, N21 3BA

Proposal: Rear conservatory

Application No.: TP/07/0669

Ward:Jubilee

(Delegated - 23-Jul-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Hearing

Appeal Decision: Appeal allowed subject to condition(s)

Decision Date: 28-May-2008

Location: 2A, CAUSEYWARE ROAD, LONDON, N9 8BS

Proposal: Redevelopment of site to provide 2 blocks of 9 flats comprising a 2-storey block of 6 x 1-bed and 1 x 2-bed flats with rooms in roof with dormer windows to front and rear, balconies to first floor at front and undercroft access and parking and a 2-storey block of 2 flats comprising 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed with first floor within roof and front dormer windows

Application No.: TP/07/0942

Ward:Upper Edmonton

(Delegated - 02-Aug-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 29-May-2008

Location: 22, GLOUCESTER ROAD, LONDON, N18 1HL

Proposal: Conversion of single family dwelling into two self contained flats (comprising 1x2 bed and 1x4 bed) with lower ground floor extension, and rear dormer window.

Application No.: TP/07/1023

Ward:Haselbury

(Delegated - 17-Aug-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 29-May-2008

Location: 30C, WESTERHAM AVENUE, LONDON, N9 9BU

Proposal: Erection of a canopy garage to rear (RETROSPECTIVE).

Application No.: TP/07/1176

Ward:Jubilee

(Delegated - 02-Aug-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 21-May-2008

Location: 53, KING EDWARDS ROAD, LONDON, N9 7RL

Proposal: Rear conservatory.

Application No.: TP/07/1204

Ward:Winchmore Hill

(Delegated - 06-Aug-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Hearing

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 21-May-2008

Location: 41, BROAD WALK, LONDON, N21 3BL

Proposal: Retain single storey rear extension (reduced scheme - RETROSPECTIVE)

Application No.: TP/07/1598

Ward:Palmers Green

(Delegated - 26-Oct-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal allowed subject to condition(s)

Decision Date: 28-May-2008

Location: 10, CHEAPSIDE, LONDON, N13 5ED

Proposal: Installation of temporary building at rear to provide classroom ancillary to existing use on ground floor.

Application No.: TP/07/1624

Ward:Highlands

(Delegated - 05-Oct-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal allowed subject to condition(s)

Decision Date: 06-May-2008

Location: 26, SLADES RISE, ENFIELD, EN2 7ED

Proposal: Demolition of detached garage and erection of a 2-storey detached garage with study at first floor, together with repositioning of vehicular access.

Application No.: TP/07/1649

Ward:Winchmore Hill

(Delegated - 05-Nov-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 01-May-2008

Location: 40, STONE HALL ROAD, LONDON, N21 1LP

Proposal: Erection of part single/ part 2 storey side and rear extension (revised scheme).

Application No.: TP/07/1666

Ward:Palmers Green

(Delegated - 29-Oct-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal withdrawn

Decision Date: 13-May-2008

Location: 13, HAZELWOOD HOUSE, NEW RIVER CRESCENT, LONDON, N13 5RE

Proposal: Construction of vehicular access to hardstanding.

Application No.: TP/07/1777

Ward:Highlands

(Delegated - 31-Oct-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 30-May-2008

Location: 42, COTSWOLD WAY, ENFIELD, EN2 7HJ

Proposal: Erection of brick boundary wall with access gates, brick piers and railings at front.(Retrospective)

Application No.: TP/07/2090

Ward: Bowes

(Delegated - 06-Dec-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed

Decision Date: 01-May-2008

Location: 105A, HIGHWORTH ROAD, LONDON, N11 2SG

Proposal: Subdivision and erection of a part single, part 2-storey 1-bed detached dwelling house.

Application No.: TP/93/0350/VAR3

Ward: Grange

(Delegated - 01-Aug-2007 - REFUSED)

Appeal Type: Written Evidence

Appeal Decision: Appeal allowed subject to condition(s)

Decision Date: 19-May-2008

Location: 23, THE GRANGEWAY, LONDON, N21 2HB

Proposal: Variation of condition 02 of approval granted under appeal ref: APP/Q5300/A/94/235993/P2 to allow extension of opening hours as follow: 11.00hrs - 21.30hrs Sundays and Bank Holidays.
