

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 24 MAY 2011**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Andreas Constantinides, Yasemin Brett, Dogan Delman, Ahmet Hasan, Nneka Keazor, Paul McCannah, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott, George Savva MBE and Toby Simon

ABSENT Kate Anolue, Jayne Buckland, Yusuf Cicek, Ertan Hurer and Tom Waterhouse

OFFICERS: Bob Ayton (Schools Organisation & Development), Linda Dalton (Legal Representative), Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director, Planning & Environmental Protection), Andy Higham (Planning Decisions Manager), Steve Jaggard (Traffic & Transportation) and Aled Richards (Head of Development Management) Jane Creer (Secretary)

Also Attending: Approximately 60 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives.
Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group.

**1
WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT**

The Chairman welcomed attendees to the Planning Committee and new Members appointed at Annual Council, and introduced Linda Dalton, Legal representative, who read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

AGREED that Councillor Simon act as Vice Chairman of Planning Committee until formal confirmation at the next meeting of the Council.

**2
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

NOTED

1. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anolue, Buckland, Cicek, Hurer and Waterhouse.
2. Councillor Waterhouse was away on honeymoon and the Committee recorded its congratulations on his recent marriage.

**3
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

NOTED that there were no declarations of interest by Members in respect of any items on the agenda.

4

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE 26 APRIL 2011

AGREED the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 26 April 2011 as a correct record.

5

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 of the meeting.

6

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (REPORT NO. 6)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning and Environmental Protection (Report No. 6).

7

LBE/11/0007 - BRAMLEY SPORTS GROUND, CHASE SIDE, LONDON, N14 5BP

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, reporting information provided by Mr L Cohen regarding membership and use of the club.

2. Receipt of an objection from David Burrowes MP including:

- membership levels demonstrated continued demand
- there was no evidence of bowls use at the site declining
- this proposal would be contrary to Policy 11 of the Core Strategy
- the proposal would have an impact on the recreational activity of users
- questioned the accessibility of alternative facilities
- the users were elderly and less likely to travel
- floodlit artificial pitches were provided elsewhere in the borough.

3. An additional condition would require improvement to the access to permit two way vehicle ingress / egress.

4. The deputation of Mr Leslie Cohen, on behalf of Bramley bowls club members, including the following points:

- a. Bowls club members were asked to stand to show the number in attendance and concerned about the loss of this facility.
- b. If this facility was demolished a lot of these members would never play bowls again, as they would not play elsewhere.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

- c. A petition of 500 names had been drawn up protesting about the proposal, in addition to petitions previously submitted.
- d. The London Mayor had stated that development proposals should protect and enhance facilities that met the needs of users.
- e. Additional information in this report set out details of alternative bowling facilities, but there were numerous reasons why these were not viable alternatives including restricted playing time, already full membership, cost, and travelling distance and expense.
- f. Within two miles there were all weather pitches in a safe facility with ample parking with spare bookings.
- g. Bramley bowls facility was used 8 to 10 hours every day of the week and on Sunday it was used for teaching children to play.
- h. This would be an unsafe location for 5 a side football in view of the large numbers of youngsters already using the neighbouring rugby pitch and what was already a dangerous road and accidents were likely.

5. Officers confirmed that no petitions had been received by the Planning Department, but that Members could take those mentioned by Mr Cohen into consideration.

6. The response of Mr Julian Bullock (Agent) and Mr Ben Underwood (Manager), including the following points:
- a. In respect of Core Strategy Policy 11, agreement with the view of the Planning Department that these facilities could be provided elsewhere.
 - b. It had been sought to identify current and future numbers of users, and it was believed that the proposal put forward would meet the needs of the whole community.
 - c. The Council's 'Everybody Active' strategy set out a strategic vision for 2009-2014, identifying priority actions to be resourced and delivered. Priorities were for everyone to participate in physical activity every day and to inspire young people to be active by providing diverse, exciting and inclusive sports activities. This proposal would meet those criteria.
 - d. This facility would be open every day.
 - e. Data from Sport England in a report for the last quarter showed a significant drop nationally in numbers participating in bowls on a weekly basis. 17 other sports had shown a reduction in participation in the same period, but bowls showed the highest reduction proportionally.
 - f. In terms of use of this facility, a membership of 300 had been quoted, but records showed 120-130 paying members who had purchased a permit to bowl for a 12 month period.
 - g. A particularly good and viable alternative provision would be available at the new Edmonton Leisure Centre from Autumn 2011 with better lighting and conditions and other support facilities including a café.

7. Lengthy discussion by Members focussing on loss of existing facility, the absence of accessible alternatives, and the availability of other all weather facilities in the vicinity.

8. In response to Members' queries about the feasibility of retaining a facility for the bowls community on the site in addition to an all weather pitch, officers

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

reported that the applicant had previously advised this would require relocation of the pedestrian footway across the park, but they could be asked to look at the option again.

9. The advice of the Traffic and Transportation officer of a potential need for more parking spaces if combined facilities were provided.

10. Members' concern that they did not have sufficient information to make an analysis of the possible options

11. The proposal that a decision on the application be deferred, supported unanimously by the Committee.

AGREED that a decision be deferred for the following reasons:

- (i) for the promoter and the club to agree a statement on current levels of use and membership
- (ii) for an analysis of the potential for a combined bowls / all weather pitch facility to be provided
- (iii) information on the availability of places at neighbouring facilities
- (iv) to establish the parking implications of a combined facility.

8

TP/10/1386 - 36, WALSINGHAM ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 6EY

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, giving details of the proposal and highlighting relevant planning decisions.

2. The deputation of Mr Tom Meadows, including the following points:

- a. He was speaking as the owner of 26, Essex Road, which directly adjoined the site, and as a member of the local community who wanted to protect the area from overdevelopment.
- b. His property would be overlooked obliquely by the double width rear aspect.
- c. There would be loss of visual amenity to his house and garden.
- d. The north facing flank wall in one corner would be less than 6 metres from the boundary.
- e. The development would be very looming and close to his garden.
- f. The size and bulk of the building would be inappropriate for the area. There would be an 80% increase in the ground footprint and the building would be significantly larger than any houses in the local area.
- g. The ratio of the garden area to the footprint would be one of the smallest in the surrounding area.
- h. The position on elevated land would exacerbate the bulk and make the house overly dominant.
- i. Modified documents and amended drawings referred to were not available on the Council website. The documents online showed discrepancies. He asked that a decision be deferred while the correct documents were made available for public scrutiny.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

3. The applicant / agent waived the right to speak in response, stating satisfaction with the officers' report.
4. The Planning Decisions Manager's clarification of modifications made to documents, and confirmation that if it was considered that members of the public would be disadvantaged by minor amendments to schemes, the Planning Department would re-consult.
5. In response to Members' queries, the confirmation by the Planning Decisions Manager that the amenity space would be larger than the minimum requirement, that Condition 7 covered tree protection, and that an Article 4 Direction had removed permitted development rights and it would not be possible to build in the garden without planning permission.
6. Discussion by Members focussing on the size, bulk and design of the proposed development and the character of the local area
7. The advice of Dennis Stacey (Conservation Advisory Group) that this scheme preserved the long views into the Conservation Area.
8. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation, on the Chairman's casting vote, voting having been tied five votes for and five votes against.

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

9

LBE/11/0003 - CHASE SIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL, TRINITY STREET, ENFIELD, EN2 6NS

NOTED

1. An amendment to the officers' recommendation to reflect that this was an LBE Council application.
2. The Chairman's requested imposition of a condition covering construction management.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee to accept the officers' recommendation.

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

Additional Condition

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

That development shall not commence until a construction methodology has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The construction methodology shall contain:

- (i) photographic condition survey of the roads, footways and verges leading to the site
- (ii) details of construction access, associated traffic management and vehicle routing to the site
- (iii) arrangements for vehicle servicing and turning areas
- (iv) arrangements for the parking of contractors vehicles
- (v) arrangements for wheel cleaning
- (vi) details of the site compound and the layout of temporary construction buildings
- (vii) arrangements for the storage of materials
- (viii) hours of work
- (ix) a construction management plan written in accordance with the 'London Best Practice Guidance: the control of dust and emission from construction and demolition'.

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

Reason: To ensure the implementation of the development does not lead to damage to the existing roads, prejudice highway safety or the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highways, and to minimise disruption to neighbouring properties.

10

LBE/11/0006 - SOUTHGATE LEISURE CENTRE, WINCHMORE HILL ROAD, LONDON, N14 6AD

NOTED

1. An amendment to the officer's recommendation to reflect that this was an LBE Council application.
2. Representations on behalf of The Wells Residents Association were reported. They raised the following points:
 - a. Concern over the effect of increased number of vehicles exiting the site via The Wells which would be detrimental to vehicle / pedestrian safety without traffic calming measures being introduced to limit speed.
 - b. Concern that there was insufficient parking to serve the expanded facility which would lead to overspill parking and congestion on surrounding roads.
 - c. The opportunity to maximise parking on the site had not been taken as more of the landscaped frontage could be set aside for parking which would reduce the impact on surrounding roads.
3. Environmental Health had no objection, subject to a condition regarding no impact piling.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

4. Additional conditions in relation to levels of works to maintain trees and amended parking layout to provide pedestrian routes.
5. The advice of the Traffic and Transportation Officer in respect of parking in The Wells.
6. The unanimous support of the Committee to accept the officers' recommendation.

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

Additional Conditions

Plan Nos

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1281.01_A; 3796 (P) 112; 3796 (P) 113; 3796 (P) 114; 3796 (P) 115; 3796 (P) 116; 3796 (P) 117; 3796 (P) 118; 3796 (P) 119; 3796 P100; 3796 P 101.

Levels

The development shall not commence until plans detailing the existing and proposed ground levels including the levels of any proposed buildings, roads and/or hard surfaced areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that levels have regard to the level of surrounding development, gradients, and surface water drainage as well as existing trees and vegetation.

Works in Proximity to Retained Trees

Prior to any construction work commencing on the enlarged parking area to the front of the Leisure Centre, details of a construction methodology detailing the extent and nature of works proposed within 5 metres of the trunk of existing trees shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed methodology.

Reason: In order to safeguard the health and retention of existing trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

Details of Construction of Retaining Wall

Prior to any construction work commencing on the enlarged parking area to the front of the Leisure Centre, detail of the foundation for and construction of the retaining wall shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed methodology.

Reason: In order to safeguard the health and retention of existing trees in the interests of the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

Amendment to Parking Layout

Prior to any development commencing, details of a pedestrian route through the middle row of parking spaces in the proposed parking layout should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The parking area shall be constructed in accordance with these revised details and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety and to improve accessibility.

Tree Protection

For the duration of the construction period all trees and shrubs shown on the approved plans and application as being retained shall be protected by fencing a minimum height of 1.2 metres at a minimum distance of 5 metres (unless otherwise agreed in writing) from the existing planting. No building activity shall take place within the protected area. Any tree or shrub which dies or is damaged during the construction period shall be replaced.

Reason: To protect existing planting during construction.

Landscaping / Replacement Planting

The development shall not commence until details of trees, shrubs and grass to be planted on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The planting scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season after completion or occupation of the development whichever is the sooner. Any planting which dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced with new planting in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory appearance and ensure that the development does not prejudice highway safety.

Impact Piling (see EH response)

No impact piling shall take place without prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

11

LBE/11/0010 - RUSSET HOUSE SCHOOL, 11, AUTUMN CLOSE, ENFIELD, EN1 4JA

NOTED

1. A schedule of conditions had been distributed to Members. Additionally, the operational hours of the MUGA would be reduced to 9pm.
2. Receipt of an objection from Sport England as assumed in the report, and additional concerns raised regarding the dimensions and surface type.
3. Receipt of an additional objection from a resident of Boleyn Avenue raising the following concerns:
 - incremental enlargement leading to a loss of amenity

- loss of open playing field and outlook.
- 4. Environmental Health raised no objection.
- 5. The unanimous support of the Committee to accept the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that, in the light of an objection by Sport England to the loss of playing fields and therefore, subject to the views of the Secretary of State, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General) Regulations 1992, planning permission be deemed to be granted, subject to conditions set out in the schedule and the amended condition above, for the reasons set out in the report.

12

TP/11/0332 - HAZELBURY INFANT AND JUNIOR SCHOOL, HASELBURY ROAD, LONDON, N9 9TT

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee to accept the officers' recommendation.

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

13

TP/11/0458 - FORTY HILL C OF E PRIMARY SCHOOL, FORTY HILL, ENFIELD, EN2 9EY

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee to accept the officers' recommendation.

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

14

APPEAL INFORMATION

NOTED the information on town planning appeals received from 08/04/2011 to 04/05/2011, summarised in tables. Full details of each appeal were available on the departmental website.

15

PLANNING PANEL RE MERRYHILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL

NOTED that a Planning Panel was held in respect of application LBE/11/0009 on 18 May 2011.

16

PLANNING PANEL RE PONDER'S END ACADEMY

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.5.2011

NOTED that the Planning Panel in respect of application LBE/11/0012 would be held on Thursday 9 June 2011 at 7.30pm.

AGREED

1. In the light of unavailability of a suitable local venue, the Planning Panel meeting would be held in the Conference Room at Enfield Civic Centre.
2. Membership of the Panel would be Councillors Simon (Chairman), Hasan, Keazor, Delman and Hurer.