

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING PANEL  
HELD ON MONDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2012**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Ertan Hurer, Ingrid Cranfield, Dogan Delman, Patricia Ekechi and Ahmet Hasan

**ABSENT**

**OFFICERS:** Sharon Davidson (Principal Planning Officer), Steve Jaggard (Transportation Planning & Policy) and Aled Richards (Head of Development Services) Metin Halil (Secretary) and Jane Creer (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Paul Walker – Assistant Director for Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management.  
Marc Clark – Project Manager, Ponders End High Street.  
Jennifer Ross – Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design.  
Paul Karakusevic – Karakusevic Carson, Lead Architects.  
Ward Councillors:  
Councillors Doug Taylor, Chaudhury Anwar, Ayfer Orhan (Ponders End Ward Councillors)  
Councillor Goddard – Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration.  
And approximately 20 members of the public / interested parties

**1  
OPENING**

**NOTED**

1. Councillor Hurer as Chairman welcomed all attendees to the meeting and introduced the Panel Members, the applicant's representatives and Council Officers.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the application and for the applicants, officers and Panel Members to listen to all the comments.
3. A decision on the application would be made by the full Planning Committee at a future date.

2

**OFFICERS' SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING ISSUES**

NOTED

1. Aled Richards, Head of Development Control, gave a brief outline of the application.
  - The application had been submitted in mid November and consultations were still ongoing and would be expiring on 7 December 2012; The Planning Department would also accept late representations up until 11 January 2013, for inclusion in the application report. After this date, any further representations can still be received up to 5:00pm on the day before the Planning Committee meeting on 29 January 2013, and these would be reported verbally to the Committee. To date the planning department has received three letters of objection to the application detailed below:
  - From: Enfield Enterprise Agency  
EPCO Holdings Ltd (230 High Street)  
Mr & Mrs Osman owners of No.s 200, 200A and 202 High Street.

Enfield Enterprise Agency object on grounds that if the scheme proceeds the Centre will be unable to continue to function.

The other two objectors, whilst generally supportive of a large scale, mixed use regeneration of the area raise the following concerns.

- Exclusion of the Mosque – which is not purpose built and not large enough. A larger purpose built mosque could be provided. It would allow for a better overall design solution rather than having to work around a fixed constraint.
- Exclusion of properties in the area around the junction between High Street and Queensway (No.s 232-244 High Street) – these are located at an important intersection and would benefit from a well considered regeneration scheme.
- No justification why these properties are not included. Represents a missed opportunity and therefore proposals cannot be considered to be genuinely comprehensive in nature.
- Part of Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area therefore any redevelopment should be truly comprehensive in nature and should include the whole of the High Street. The development fails to accord with the emerging strategic policy by not being comprehensive.
- The former Post Office site, High Street – should be included to provide additional development flexibility by providing potential relocation accommodation for displaced businesses.
- Extinguishment of a number of viable and long standing local businesses and provision needs to be made for relocation of these to other appropriate locations.

2. It was intended to present the application to Planning Committee at its meeting on Tuesday 29 January 2013 and the Committee would also receive the notes from the Planning Panel meeting. The agenda for that meeting would be published on the Council's web site on Friday 18 January 2013.

### 3

#### **PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT/AGENT**

##### NOTED

1. Paul Karakusevic of Karakusevic Carson Lead Architects, gave an introduction of the proposals:
  - Karakusevic Carson Lead Architects were appointed four months ago to provide an holistic master plan for regenerating and improving the Former Middlesex University Campus Site, 188-230 (even) (excluding No.228), Ponders End High Street and Ponders End Library & Associated parking area, College Court.
  - The key aspects are to regenerate the High Street and the rear of the university, leading back to the wider site. The approach for re-development would be family orientated and the economic regeneration of the area. The key objectives of this integrated development would be:
    - a. Re-location of the College Court Library.
    - b. Retain and refurbish the listed Broadbent building, caretaker's cottage and gymnasium to provide residential floorspace, commercial floorspace and floorspace for community use.
    - c. Retain and refurbish the Queensway multi-storey car park to provide 119 parking spaces (89 residential & 30 for Enfield Enterprise employees).
    - d. To provide up to 408 new mixed tenure residential units, 567 sqm of commercial floorspace, 776sqm of new mixed retail floorspace and 156sqm of new community floorspace.
    - e. Parking spaces for 252 cars.
    - f. Introduction of a new public open space, high quality public realm and private amenity space.
  - In terms of the wider context, the site lies within the Ponders End Regeneration Priority Area and within the area covered by the Ponders End Central Planning Brief. There have already been improved transport links in the area due to the new school academy in South Street, encouraging parents from the development to walk or to use public transport.
  - The High Street shop frontages to be straightened and restored with new shop fronts. Pavements along the High Street would be improved and brought back to life with a quality surface to walk on.

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

- At present, the University site is disconnected from the High Street. Passage ways into court yards to be created for mixed use retail & commercial use. Enhancements to be made to the ecology garden and a green route, with enhanced landscaping, to be created to connect the High Street to the Broadbent building at the rear of the site.
- The proposed development would follow an established east-west street pattern with two main streets and pedestrian friendly home zones. The street design would allow for pedestrian and cycle priority over vehicles. The speed limit for the site would be 20mph. The streets have been designed for people, with emphasis on play areas and growing space.
- One of the new streets would house 4-5 storey apartment buildings and the remaining street would house lower level apartments. Terraced houses and maisonettes would be situated centrally to the development.
- The proposed illustrative housing mix can be viewed on the agenda and is in line with the maximum number of units that can be provided for the site as stated in the Ponders End Planning Brief. The viability assessment confirms that the maximum number of affordable housing units that can be delivered by the scheme is approximately 30%, based on the proposed housing mix supplied.
- It was stated that the housing units would have large bedrooms and large family living spaces.
- The existing multi storey car park on Queensway, would be refurbished with new gates, landscaped and back into use. The new energy centre would be located at the rear of the car park.
- Car parking – The High Street proposals would be smaller units with an allocation of 0.5 parking spaces per unit. The multi-storey car park on Queensway would provide 0.65 parking spaces per unit equating to 3 parking spaces for every 4 properties. It was advised that a large majority of car parking would be off street, utilising the existing multi storey car park. The level of car parking provision falls within the London Plan car parking standard.
- The listed Broadbent building at the rear of the development would be re-connected to the new street pattern within the development. It is to be refurbished, with the removal of existing work shops at the rear and infilling these with new buildings. The windows to be refurbished or replaced and repairs to the roof and facades. The interior of the building has been designed to include residential apartments and commercial units. There would be generous living and work spaces, exposed structures and large windows. There would be a complimentary mix of 2/3/4 bedroom apartments on the upper levels of the building with commercial units at ground level.

## 4

### QUESTIONS BY PANEL MEMBERS

NOTED the following questions and observations from Members of the Panel.

1. Councillor Cranfield asked questions in respect of improvements to the retail element of the development, how this would be achieved, about play spaces for the 'family friendly' development and the size of proposed houses to the south of the development. It was advised that the middle section of the High Street was vibrant on both sides but declined after the University moved away. The developer was looking at increasing residential use to support shops on the High Street and create an environment for business to flourish in. In reality, general improvements of this middle section of the High Street would depend on approximately 400 new homes of the development as well as additional people moving into the area. Bringing the High Street back to life and allowing the street to work would be integral to the scheme. In response to play spaces, it was advised that, integral to the scheme, every house would have a garden, the re-location of the nursery into the Broadbent Building, creation of mature and grown up play spaces and play spaces within each home zone. Play areas would be generous in size and would contribute to a family orientated environment. The houses to the south of the development would be either 2,3 or 4 bedroom houses.
2. Councillor Ekechi asked about street parking and if there were enough parking spaces. It was confirmed that there would be some street parking, that the multi storey car park would provide parking and that the developers had enough parking allocation for the scheme as measured against London Plan and the Enfield Core Strategy.
3. Councillor Hasan asked questions about the difference between the current application and application No. P12-00732PLA, traffic issues and security measures for the residential units. It was advised that the difference between this application and application No. P12-00732PLA is the density of the scheme, as it was based around family homes and not flats. The current application offers low rise housing with the biggest difference being family focussed high quality housing, a quantum of affordable housing, completely integrated housing which has exceeded the London Plan housing standard and numerous play spaces including the possible enhancement of Ponders End Park. Housing units had been brought down to a sustainable level , offering and creating housing that people would want to live in. The application addressed sustainable transport by including the:
  - Correct amount of parking;
  - Pedestrian links;
  - By promoting a walking orientated environment/pedestrian friendly
  - Two entrances into the site.The security aspect of the development would be self surveillance. The developer would be making every street overlooked, by lining streets with property front doors increasing the perception of personal safety.
4. Councillor Delman commented that he was pleased about the family orientated housing units, but this would mean an increase in children. He asked questions regarding children's play areas, inclusion and re-

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

development of the Mosque, the number of integrated work/home units and amenity space. It was advised that a green boulevard (300m long) was to be created along with a nature garden, communal gardens (courtyard configuration) within the three main residential blocks and a garden for each family house along the southern boundary of the site. It was further advised that the Mosque was not a listed building but was pivotal on the High Street. An area behind the Mosque may evolve into a creative space. The existing footprint of the Mosque was not within the boundaries of the proposed development but the master plan was flexible to allow for its growth. Councillor Delman responded that this was an opportunity to see if the owners, developer and the Council would include the Mosque for development and to update the facility. Paul Walker, Assistant Director, responded that the Council had had positive discussions with the owners of the Mosque regarding its possible expansion as they played an important role in the local community.

It was further advised that the work/live in units were a very valuable type of use and was a good combination. However, if a business within say one of the live/work units failed, there would be no loss of home to the owner/tenant. Even though the residential units may be increased from 391 to 408, the amenity space would still be within the guidelines set by the London Plan. The increase is due to 4 bed apartments being split into 2 bed apartments.

5. Councillor Hurer asked if the developer was hoping that some homes have no cars or would there be no car ownership properties, visitor car parking and waste/recycling collections. It was advised that some residents would have permits to park and others will be no car facility units. Visitor car parking would be built into the street scape. There would be a pedestrian friendly shared waste & recycling route through the development which has been tested.

## 5

### QUESTIONS BY WARD COUNCILLORS

NOTED the following questions and observations from Local Ward Councillors.

1. Councillor Doug Taylor, Leader of the Council and Ponders End Ward Councillor, asked the following questions:
  - The planning panel had made reference to a previous application for the site. Explain the number of units on the previous application and the present one?
  - There is a transport constraint to the site from Queensway and Kingsway. What may happen to transport to Kingsway and certain increased traffic?
  - What is the current traffic proposal for the southern element of the site and in terms of the traffic impact report on the site, what was the impact on the university site?
  - Amenity space – are all the green areas and designations, open to change or use?

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

Aled Richards advised that there were two applications that were to be determined. The other application was from Inpath Limited, which had a smaller development site with 471 proposed residential units and the present Council application, which is a larger development site that proposes 408 residential units.

It was advised that there would be no proposed connections from Derby Road to the southern end of the development and no radical alterations proposed for alleviating any increased traffic generation.

The traffic impact on the site had been surveyed by looking at old traffic data for the university site.

It was further advised that the developer would be building to the London Plan standard with a high level of green spaces and sustainable homes.

2. Councillor Ayfer Orhan, Ponders End Ward Councillor, asked questions about green energy for the site, including solar power; and cycling provision, especially for children on the development. It was advised that the development would have a green energy station, housing gas boilers which will provide heating and hot water generation for the development. The new homes would have 4-5 times the insulation that had previously been used in new homes, with excellent new window systems, which have all been factored into the scheme. The development's centralised energy plan will also include solar energy. There would also be approximately 600 bicycle spaces within the development. Some of these will be located in communal areas and others in bike stores in gardens. This would be a cycle friendly scheme. The multi storey car park will be used primarily for car parking, reducing parking on roads. The scheme had been designed for slow traffic (10mph) so that kids can cycle and play on roads. There would be traffic calming measures in place, stopping short cuts and rat runs through the development, thus putting pedestrians first.
3. Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration, said that the application would have to be assessed on its own merits as an application, but that a number of wider issues had been raised about the future of the wider area and how it operates, and these would be looked at separately as part of the normal business of the Council.

## 6

### OPEN SESSION - QUESTIONS AND VIEWS FROM THE FLOOR

NOTED the following questions and observations from attendees:

1. A resident commented that she had lived and ran a business in the area in excess of 50 years. She had walked and cycled, in the area,

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

when she was younger. There was now serious transport issues on the High Road, making it very difficult to get onto the High Road and sometimes 30 minutes to travel out of Ponders End. Referring to the current application, businesses will have cars and vans coming in and out of the development which will not be environmentally friendly. The maisonette where she lived suffered from anti social behaviour with an abundance of rubbish accumulation. With more people coming to live in the development, this intense site will look unsightly. It was advised that it was difficult to curtail the buy to let market, but the developer could make houses more attractive so that new residents could take pride in their homes. Studio's and smaller apartments formed a smaller percentage of the housing mix of the scheme. Three bedroom properties and above accounted for 65% of the scheme, encouraging family based accommodation so residents would stay longer in these properties and be part of the community.

2. A resident raised concern about businesses and transport issues surrounding lorry deliveries to the industrial area of the development. It was advised that this issue would be part of a traffic management programme to stop businesses suffering.
3. An attendee commented that as there was no provision for a day nursery within the development and only one day nursery in the area, was there any provision for a childcare facility within the Master Plan? It was advised that there was a possibility that a childcare facility could be accommodated in the Broadbent Building. Paul Walker, Assistant Director of Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management said that he would be pleased to discuss this property matter after the meeting.
4. A resident commented that their garden currently backs onto the student accommodation block. The development plans show that the accommodation block would be replaced with two blocks of apartments imposing her property and that the proposed new road seems very close to her property. She was also very concerned about security, overlooking & privacy and the proposed new road accessing college Court and the High Street. It was advised that it was very important that residents had gardens. The developer would be creating rear gardens backing onto garden walls and fences. Some properties may benefit from a more typical garden backing onto a garden, by the creation of a green corridor through the development. The resident was further advised that her garden would be backed up to a high quality wall, trees and planting. The proposed new road behind her property would be 4-5 metres from her home. The two apartment blocks behind her property (shown on plan) would not be facing her home. The rear of her home will be facing the new residential street instead. The Master Plan will address overlooking when window design is implemented and will also be considered by the Planning Committee.
5. The Chief Executive of Enfield Enterprise Centre asked about the Queensway Enterprise Centre, which includes 57 industrial units and employs approximately 300 people. It was a busy estate and the resident was alarmed that the car park at the end of the estate was being taken away. What was the rationale behind this decision? It was

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

advised that it was not the intention of the scheme to jeopardise the Enterprise Centre, but in order to achieve the building of one of the schemes new street, some land from the estate car park would be needed. However, the scheme already allowed for the provision of 30 car spaces within the revamped multi storey car park. The Council and developer would continue talking to the Enterprise Centre. Councillor Hurer asked about the ownership of the multi storey car park. It was advised that the multi storey car park is closed at present. When the Council open it, it will have 90 spaces in total. The Chief Executive of Enfield Enterprise Centre then mentioned that there would be issues about delivery and van management. It was advised that vans would still be able to access the area and service businesses. The access way into the estate may be shared and the scheme may look at how successful the shared access will be.

6. An attendee raised the following concerns:
  - Parking and access to the development/industrial estate would be the biggest problem.
  - Only 3/25 people attending the panel meeting did not own a car. People moving into Ponders End, would need a car.
  - With only 3 car spaces for every 4 residential apartments available, no one will buy, due to lack of parking availability.
  - The development will turn into a ghetto.
  - The Enfield Master Plan talks about reducing crime, but it will get worse with this scheme.
  - The proposed accessway into the industrial units is ridiculous.
  - The Enterprise Centre has many deliveries by 40 feet lorries and the developer is trying to attract families with children?
  - With all the access problems of the scheme, a lot more accidents would occur.
  - How will the deliveries to the Enterprise Centre get there? There would not be any parking at the Queensway end of the site.
  - All commercial vehicles in the area would congest the surrounding roads.
  - Don't mix light industrial areas with housing.

It was advised by Councillor Hurer, that the Mayor's London Plan sets the level for parking standards. The Planning Committee must have robust reasons for refusal of planning permission or the application of conditions or decisions may be overruled at a future appeal.

7. Councillor Hurer asked for clarification as to what type of industries would be occupying the industrial units, what was anticipated i.e. arts, culture. Councillor Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration, opined that creative industries are currently moving out of London and the incentive would be how the developers/Council would capture and develop these industries. This would be an opportunity to do that. The use of Queensway and what is adjacent to the development site would have to be thought through aswell.
8. An attendee asked what opportunities there would be for local employment, if there is such a shortage of parking for the industrial site.

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

It was advised that this would be an issue for traffic management which will be brought to the Planning Committee when the application is considered. Historically, the university site had generated traffic figures and the developer would do their homework as regards traffic management.

9. A local business man commented that all traffic on the site would have to go in and out of the area. There would be more traffic on Queensway. Where would the access way to the multi storey car park be located? There would be more cars coming out of the development at Queensway which will always be congested. How would this be managed? It was advised that the developer would be looking at access ways to and from the development. There would be a small rear access way to exit the development for local journeys. The existing junction at the library would be improved and traffic calming measures to be put in place. The developers were aware of transport and traffic issues of Queensway and these would be investigated.
10. A local business owner asked the following questions:
  - He was aware that the Panel were looking at two applications for the site. Is the present application being considered more than the previous one?
  - Once the application is agreed, would there be room for more dialogue?
  - Once the new development roads had been built, would they all be leading to Queensway?
  - It was advised that the Planning Panel were there to hear the Council's scheme. The first application by Inpath Ltd (P12-00732PLA & P12-00733HER) was a full application which would be heard by the Planning Committee on Tuesday 18 December 2012. The present Council application (P12-02677PLA) should be determined at Planning Committee in January 2013. The Panel would just be listening to the proposals this evening. It was an outline application and additional information (reserved matters) must be received regarding the application from the developers. The time frame to receive this information would be up to the developer. Only the outline planning application would be going to Planning Committee, not detailed information.
  - It was further advised that it would be difficult to develop a road from the High Street to Queensway. The developer would be creating a green link from the High Street to Queensway. Councillor Hurer commented that traffic generation could also be created by parents and children. The developer had looked at schools, local employment and the local infrastructure of the area.

An attendee from the Ponders End Community Development Trust (PECDT) commented that 15,000 people had moved into the area since 1999 and that this was not a new problem. The site had been empty since 2008. Major developments were often not carried out by Local Authorities well. An example of this was the new Academy School in South Street where lorries are entering areas they shouldn't. The development had to be managed better. He and

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

others would be living in a mess and trying to run a business. Councillor Hurer advised that a transport study would include the monitoring of contractors by the Council, but that the problem was that sometimes contractors did not respond. Aled Richards, Head of Development Control, advised that construction should be improved and communicated. He was unhappy to hear about the construction problems regarding the Academy but advised that should approval be granted to the development a construction management report should be submitted.

11. A local businessman commented that business owners will be affected by the scheme. The planning authority should look at the impact of the development in the area and that economic regeneration would be difficult to achieve. It was advised that business matters were not material to the planning application.

Paul Walker, Assistant Director – Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management commented that a longer view would be needed. This was only an outline application, the detailed application would address how the development would be built and managed. The Council would try and minimise any problems to residents and he stated that when something new is built there is always an element of disruption and inconvenience. Councillor Hurer commented that one complaint received by residents was that they were not being informed. The attendee stated that the PECDT would meet more regularly so as to better inform businesses and residents through newsletters, but it would be a good idea perhaps to set up a business forum for business. His repeated concern was, what do businesses do to plan long term? It was advised that the Council can learn from experience to inform residents & businesses better, so information flows easily. Residents/business owners could contact Paul Walker - Assistant Director – Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management or Marc Clark – Project Manager (Ponders End High Street) to speak to, on a one to one basis, for any issues they may have regarding the scheme, including the possibility of a business forum for business.

12. A local resident asked whether any thought had been given to closing the Queensway entrance and providing access to and from Hertford Road to the development. This may solve transport issues surrounding Queensway. An emergency access way could be provided at Queensway. It was advised that the Queensway issue had already been addressed with reasons given. Part of the thinking has been to minimise traffic flow through the site. Councillor Hurer advised that there would be another month before the application is heard and for residents to contact Steve Jaggard – Group Leader (Transport Planning & Policy) and let him know their views.
13. An attendee asked if there would be vehicular access into Derby Road from the new road within the development. It was advised that there would not be access from Derby Road.
14. A local resident commented that some of the proposed apartments would be overlooking the Mosque. There was a lot of traffic activity around the Mosque especially at Ramadan time which lasts for one month. Cars were parked in the immediate area and some attendees of

## PLANNING PANEL - 3.12.2012

the Mosque would also pray outside the Mosque. The resident had no issues with religion but there was a lot of traffic generation and noise throughout the month of Ramadan. Surrounding roads were clogged up with parked cars. The resident had thought that the Mosque would be re-located from the area.

15. An attendee commented that car 'joy riding' was an issue in the nearby Tesco's car park and that an alternative route to the A1010 should be created by negotiating with Tesco's. Tesco's traffic should be coming in from Queensway to alleviate traffic issues.
16. Aled Richards, Head of Development Control, stated that any residents who wish to make any representations about the application and for inclusion into the report, may do so before 11 January 2013. Any representations made after this date will be read out at the Planning Committee on the day.

## 7

### CLOSE OF MEETING

NOTED the closing points, including:

1. The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.
2. Notes taken at this meeting would be appended to the Planning Officers' report to be considered by the Planning Committee when the application was presented for decision.
3. There was a deputation procedure whereby involved parties could request to address the Planning Committee meeting (details on the Council website or via the Planning Committee Secretary 020 8379 4093/4091 [jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk) or [metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk) and residents could also ask ward councillors to speak on their behalf.
4. Full details of the application were available to view and download from the Council's website [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk) (Application Ref: P12-02677PLA).