

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2013**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Andreas Constantinides, Kate Anolue, Lee Chamberlain, Ingrid Cranfield, Dogan Delman, Christiana During, Ahmet Hasan, Ertan Hurer, Nneka Keazor, Derek Levy, Paul McCannah, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott, George Savva MBE and Toby Simon

ABSENT

OFFICERS: Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Planning, Highways & Transportation), Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Linda Dalton (Legal Services), Bob Ayton (Schools Organisation & Development), Steve Jaggard (Traffic & Transportation), Ray Reilly (Principal Planning Officer) and Ned Johnson (Health Safety & Pollution) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

Also Attending: Approximately 150 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives
Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration
Dennis Stacey, Chairman, Conservation Advisory Group
Ward Councillors: Councillor Robert Hayward and Councillor Joanne Laban

312

WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and the Legal Services representative read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

313

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

NOTED that there were no apologies for absence.

314

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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

315

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 20 AUGUST 2013

AGREED the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 20 August 2013 as a correct record.

316

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING PANEL HELD ON 28 FEBRUARY 2013 - NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD APPLICATIONS

RECEIVED the minutes of the Planning Panel held on Thursday 28 February 2013.

317

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION (REPORT NO. 79)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning, Highways and Transportation (Report No.79).

318

ORDER OF AGENDA

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

319

P13-01929PLA - FORESTERS HALL, 44, CHASE SIDE, ENFIELD, EN2 6NF

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, confirming the original planning permission (TP/11/1562) and conditions, and the variation (P12-01274PLA), and clarifying the background to this proposal. Comments from Environmental Health included in the report were highlighted. The case was finely weighted, but on balance, the harm to residents' amenity from the continued use of the garden was considered sufficient to outweigh the merits of the application and the recommendation was for refusal.
2. Confirmation of an online petition in support of the proposals containing 740 signatures. Advice that detailed analysis of this had not been undertaken to establish where the signatories came from, and that the volume of support for an application was not in itself a material consideration.
3. A copy of the petition and letters of parental concern had been distributed to Members.
4. Members had also received a copy of the comments of Mr Gordon Draper of no 46 Chase Side, adjoining the site, and those of Mrs F Hennessy in response to the article in this week's press.

5. The deputation of Mrs Kaye Wildman, Director of Nursery on the Green, including the following points:
 - a. It was now a statutory requirement of the Early Years Framework that nurseries must provide access to an outdoor play area, or ensure that outdoor activities are planned and taken on a daily basis.
 - b. The outdoor play area can be any open space, but there were no facilities in Enfield suitable and safe for crawling babies, and taking children to Chase Green was hazardous because of the need to cross roads and first check the play area is safe before use.
 - c. The garden was a stimulating safe haven for children to play, learn and develop physical skills which could have a life long legacy.
 - d. Preventing use of the garden would also have a detrimental effect on the nursery children's emotional wellbeing.
 - e. It was confirmed there was no 'statutory nuisance' as indicated at para 4.1.3 of the report, but an unfair comparison was made with a baseline of zero when there is background noise when the nursery was not in use.
 - f. There was no mention of the impact of the local Chase Side Primary School, which had over 400 pupils and undoubtedly contributed to noise levels in the vicinity, especially at break times.
 - g. In March 2011 an application was made by another party to allow for a 48 place day nursery and, although permission was refused, there were no objections raised by Environmental Health to that application.
 - h. Residents of 2, 3, 4 and 5 Lambs Walk had signed the same generic letter of complaint, yet their gardens were less than 80 metres from Chase Side school playground.
 - i. The area was not wholly residential. There was a large office block adjacent to the nursery.
 - j. Foresters Hall was originally built as a meeting hall and there was noise associated with these activities which pre-dated recent residential development, and this area was a vibrant urban community. Therefore there is no loss of amenity to residents.
 - k. Environmental Health had only visited the site on four occasions since August 2012 and it appeared that complaints were only made following submission of this application. CCTV recordings had been offered to Environmental Health so they had something tangible to measure, but this offer had not been taken up.
 - l. The right to play was enshrined in Article 31 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
6. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
 - a. Confirmation that the application under consideration was for permanent permission for use of the rear outdoor play area as in condition 9. No alternative arrangements had been put forward by the applicant for example a smaller number of children outside at a given time.
 - b. The advice of the School Organisation & Development Officer in respect of Ofsted and requirements regarding access to play space was received that play space is a requirement but it does not have to be onsite provision.
 - c. The advice of the Principal Officer Health Safety & Pollution, who had visited the complainants, confirming that the majority of the noise was from the nursery children playing and there was noise attributable to the

staff also. Noise was audible in the neighbouring residential properties with the windows closed. The complainants lived very close to the nursery, which was quite clearly the source of the noise. Environmental Health had received some complaints in February / March 2013 but a visit had not been requested at that time. Officers were asked to make a visit when the weather got better and children were out more.

d. Members' expressions of sympathy to neighbouring residents and to the nursery operation and children's needs, their concerns in respect of the officers' recommendation and discussions regarding a pragmatic way forward with some appropriate compromise.

7. A proposal for a six month extension to current planning permission with all existing conditions, within which time the applicant could consider revisions to the proposals, which may be applied for a limited period for assessment before further consideration by Planning Committee.
8. The unanimous vote of the Committee not to agree the officers' recommendation of refusal for the variation of condition 9 of planning permission reference TP/11/1562.
9. The unanimous support of the Committee for the proposal discussed.
10. Officers advised to engage with the applicant with a view to establishing what measures may be put in place to mitigate the noise impact on adjoining residents. The applicant to implement any agreed measures and submit a new application after the six month period, to include the measures to be employed/adopted, and any new application to be reported back to Committee. Complaints to be monitored throughout.

AGREED that planning permission be granted for the continued use of the garden in accordance with the previous limitation on hours of use and numbers of children for a further period of six months.

320

P12-02858PLA - 1-5 LYNTON COURT, 80-98 BOWES ROAD, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE ADJACENT TO 80 BOWES ROAD (SITE 6A, B, C BOWES ROAD), LONDON, N13 4NP

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Senior Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals.
2. Correction to the proposal on page 55 of the officers' report: fourth line should read 38 units and not 40.
3. Para 2.15 should read 118 cycle parking spaces.
4. Para 4.2.1 should state 33 units as opposed to 35 units.
5. Para 6.8.3 should state 88 units as opposed to 90 units.
6. Receipt of two additional objections raising concerns about the density of the proposed developments.
7. Additional Highways comments:
 - a. Since publication of the report, Transport for London (TfL) had provided additional comments pertaining to the exit from Broomfield Road and had requested that the safety of this access be re-assessed. This had been discussed by Highways officers and TfL and agreed that an additional pre-

commencement Grampian condition requesting further analysis of this access/junction be carried out.

b. As noted in para 6.8.19, the Council's Highways department raised concerns about the lack of parking surveys on the surrounding streets. Additional comments had now been provided in relation to additional parking survey information submitted, assessing parking conditions on Westminster Drive and Broomfield Road. This survey concluded that there was no parking capacity on Westminster Drive, with the highest parking pressure on Broomfield Road at 79% capacity. However the parking survey did not take into account the existing approximately 12 parking spaces that would be lost as a result of this development, although these spaces were on private land owned by the applicant. Nevertheless, taking into account the benefits of the scheme providing additional housing, particularly family housing and the high levels of affordable homes and the relative good accessibility to public transport, it was considered that on balance the scheme remained acceptable and that any refusal on parking grounds would be difficult to uphold. Taking into account the tenure mix, Traffic & Transportation has confirmed that this site would result in lower levels of car ownership and that the parking ratio put forward remained policy compliant. It had also been advised that the situation could be improved further by the imposition of a parking management plan.

8. Additional Air Quality comments. An amended air quality assessment had been submitted which has been deemed acceptable by Environmental Health. Officers had confirmed that Enfield did not meet its nitrogen dioxide levels and that the objective for annual mean was exceeded along this section of the North Circular Road (NCR). There were properties within what was regarded as an exceedance area, which is generally regarded as 30 metres from the road. Environmental Health did not consider the proximity of the proposed buildings to the NCR warranted refusal, but had stated that measures would need to be introduced into the development such as mechanical ventilation to improve matters as these buildings were within the exceedance area.
9. The deputation of Mr Simon Cliff, representing Broomfield Home Owners and Residents' Association and Broomfield Road Residents' Association, including the following points:
 - a. There were a number of concerns regarding the proposals, the main issues being scale and design, parking and traffic, and air quality.
 - b. The development would not be sympathetic to its surroundings in design or physical appearance.
 - c. Copies of photographs had been distributed to Members which showed the greenness of Broomfield Road, with many trees and plants, and characteristics which were worth preserving. The development would be within metres of the row of 150 year old cottages.
 - d. Copies of CGI images of the proposed developments had also been distributed to Members. The back of Block B would be visible directly from the western end of Broomfield Road. The modernistic development would be wholly inappropriate in context here.
 - e. Parking provision would be inadequate, and removal of most of the existing on-street parking on Broomfield Road would have a severe impact on existing residents.

- f. Traffic would increase in and out of Broomfield Road and the access point between Blocks C and D. The junctions were difficult even now. The junction of Broomfield Road with NCR was a major concern.
- g. The other issue of great concern was air quality. If there was a need to rely on measures like windows that did not open and mechanical air conditioning to provide decent air, this was not sustainable housing.
- 10. The response of Mr Richard Pearce, Senior Project Manager, Notting Hill Housing, including the following points:
 - a. This proposal and application P12-02859PLA were part of the vision for the NCR for larger regeneration opportunities under the draft North Circular Road Area Action Plan and contributed to the target of providing 1300 new homes, and in particular affordable housing.
 - b. This proposal would provide 121 high quality houses and flats to meet the Council's aspirations for the area and address local housing needs.
 - c. There had been extensive negotiation with the local community, including exhibitions and public meetings. Feedback received had been acted on. There had been a significant reduction in the height of blocks.
 - d. Officers had concluded that the development would not be overbearing, there would be adequate separation, and no shadowing effect, and relationships were satisfactory.
 - e. The CGI images shown by the depute were out of date.
 - f. The frontage position on NCR was important, and was a sign of the regeneration of the area.
 - g. The trees were mostly of poor quality and condition, and there would be introduction of new trees and landscaping.
 - h. Numbers of car parking spaces were consistent with policies and the London Plan.
 - i. He was aware of concerns raised at the Member site visit regarding the right hand turn from Broomfield Road, and Notting Hill Housing were happy to work with the Council and residents to address these issues.
- 11. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
 - a. The advice of the Group Leader – Transportation Planning & Policy in respect of improvements to Broomfield Road.
 - b. Confirmation of changes in levels on the site.
 - c. Confirmation that properties in Broomfield Road were not listed, and advice in respect of the appearance of the development.
 - d. Members' concerns regarding loss of trees and natural environment, and officers' clarification of planting and screening.
 - e. Members' concerns regarding the access and officers' confirmation that detailed junction design was yet to be brought forward and the junction improvement would be subject to a road safety audit and TfL approval.
 - f. The Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration emphasised the efforts made by the applicant and the borough's need for affordable housing units.
- 12. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 12 votes for, 2 votes against and 1 abstention.

AGREED that subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement, and subject to an additional Grampian condition to ensure that development does not commence until details of the Broomfield Road/NCR junction have been

submitted and approved, including the relevant safety audits, the Planning Decisions Manager / Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

321

P12-02859PLA - 102-118 AND REAR OF 120-138 (KNOWN AS SITE 6D), BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N13 4NP

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Senior Planning Officer, clarifying the proposals.
2. The proposal should read 33 units and not 35 with the mix being 8 x 1 bed, 19 x 2 bed, and 6 x 3 bed.
3. The deputation of Mr Simon Cliff, representing Broomfield Home Owners and Residents' Association and Broomfield Road Residents' Association, that the points he made in respect of P12-02858PLA also applied to this application.
4. Mr Richard Pearce, Senior Project Manager, Notting Hill Housing did not wish to make any further points.
5. Members had debated all issues while considering the previous application P12-02858PLA.
6. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 14 votes for and 1 abstention.

AGREED that subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement, the Planning Decisions Manager / Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

322

P12-01749PLA - 213-219, BAKER STREET, ENFIELD, EN1 3LA

NOTED

1. The meeting resumed after a brief adjournment to allow those members of the public who wished, to leave the meeting.
2. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals.
3. Receipt of six further letters of objection. The objections were summarised as:
 - Height of the development is out of keeping with the character and street scene of this part of Baker Street, a key route into Enfield Town.
 - Detrimental impact on light to neighbouring properties.
 - Balconies will lead to an intrusion of privacy.
 - Two shop units will create further congestion and dependent on the type of business that will occupy – noise, disruption, litter, extended hours, etc.
 - Long established businesses will be forcibly pushed out of the area, businesses that provide a valuable service to the locality.
 - Plant on the roof of the building will further increase its height and emit continuous noise and pollution.

- Parking provision is inadequate.
 - Congestion and road safety – any deliveries would increase congestion and create further hazards for road users and pedestrians.
 - Increase in traffic noise.
 - Measures should be put in place to protect adjacent properties during building works.
 - Adjacent properties will be vulnerable to burglary/vandalism during the build and afterwards.
 - A drain running across the site and Thames Water will be made aware to ensure the development does not contravene building byelaws.
 - Cctv camera does not prevent people parking illegally.
 - No need for an additional convenience store in this area.
 - Opening hours – 7 days per week up to 11pm will mean a constant flow of traffic. Existing shops in the area already have extended opening hours so not necessary here.
4. Correction to the report: para 6.35 should refer to Condition 34, not 24 as stated.
 5. The deputation of Mrs Christine English and Mr Michael English, including the following points:
 - a. They represented residents of Churchbury Road and Ivinghoe Close.
 - b. The development would be much higher than other buildings in the vicinity and would cause loss of light, and overlooking.
 - c. Balconies would overlook a private play area.
 - d. Loss of the current garage boundary would leave residences open to theft and vandalism.
 - e. Concerns remained in respect of unsurveyed drains on site.
 - f. Parking was already problematical in the area. There was no parking provision for customers or staff or ATM users.
 - g. There were many local schools, and this development would increase the traffic and hazard levels.
 - h. The size of the proposed development was inappropriate.
 - i. The density would be greater than London Plan standards.
 - j. The roof plant would make the development five storeys equivalent.
 - k. Piling would damage adjoining residential properties.
 - l. A 24/7 operation would increase noise.
 - m. Unloading of deliveries would cause chaos and force families to use the highway to pass.
 - n. Refuse and recycling collections would involve obstruction on the road.
 6. The statement of Councillor Joanne Laban, Town Ward Councillor, including the following points:
 - a. She had been contacted by many constituents who opposed this application.
 - b. The main objections were height, design and massing, inadequate parking provision, and invasion of privacy from overlooking, and there would be a significant change in views from Ivinghoe Close.
 - c. The proposals were not compliant with many national and regional policies including DMD 9, 2H9 and LP 3.2.
 - d. There should be communal amenity space for children's play.
 7. The response of Mr Gerry Wade, the agent on behalf of the applicant, including the following points:

- a. There had been many months of discussions with officers.
 - b. This was a brownfield site, and there would be provision of much needed housing, in accordance with national and local policies.
 - c. There had been amendments from previous proposals, including reduction from 12 to 10 flats, and the mass had been significantly altered.
 - d. This was a four storey development, with recess to all elevations at upper storeys. The plant room was not additional height, but at third floor level. The street scene elevation followed heights of buildings to the south.
 - e. Windows and balconies were positioned so as not to cause overlooking.
 - f. It was intended to retain boundary wall conditions to a similar height as presently.
 - g. Additional landscaping had been introduced, and a green roof.
 - h. The proposals were consistent with virtually all planning policies and the London Plan.
8. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
- a. The advice of the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of the building line, policy compliance, and clarification in respect of siting of balconies, that minimum distancing standards were exceeded, and details of heights and storeys of other properties in the vicinity.
 - b. Confirmation there was existing retail on site without dedicated parking.
 - c. Members had found the site visit useful and noted potential advantages from the development.
 - d. Responses to Members' concerns regarding amenity space. This was met through balconies. The scope for green landscaping had been improved, and that communal amenity space was not characteristic of frontages to Baker Street.
 - e. Officers' clarification of viability considerations.
9. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 13 votes for, 1 vote against and 1 abstention.

AGREED that planning permission be granted, subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

323

P13-02165PLA - 28, GREENWAY, LONDON, N14 6NN

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Head of Development Management, confirming the revisions to proposals, the previous concerns raised, that Members had made a site visit, and that the Conservation Advisory Group objected.
2. The deputation of Mr Neil Paddon-Smith, neighbouring resident, including the following points:
 - a. He objected to this incremental aggravated scheme, for which this was the fourth application in the last year.
 - b. The proposal would not be compliant with policies, particularly UDP policy (II) H12. There would be an adverse impact.

- c. There had not been special regard to the Conservation Area. The rear of the property was important as well as the frontage.
- d. The applicants should be redirected to progress what was previously agreed.
- 3. The statement of Councillor Robert Hayward, Southgate Ward Councillor, including the following points:
 - a. Applications should not be granted unless they enhanced the Conservation Area.
 - b. Conservation Area restrictions should also apply to the rear of properties.
 - c. The policies' wording tended to overly raise neighbours' expectations.
- 4. The response of Mr Ben Morris, agent for the applicant, including the following points:
 - a. The application was only a slight enlargement of the scheme previously approved, and prior to its submission it had been discussed with officers what could be achieved.
 - b. The Conservation Area character appraisal did not place limits on first floor rear extension.
 - c. Officers considered this proposal acceptable and would not adversely impact on the neighbours' residential amenities.
- 5. The comments of Mr Dennis Stacey, Chairman, Conservation Advisory Group (CAG), included the following points:
 - a. CAG would emphasise the importance of the Arts and Crafts façade, and that the roofs were very handsome.
 - b. There should be regard to quality and design of existing buildings. Their erosion bit by bit made people question the point of Conservation Area status.
- 6. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
 - a. Comments that the previous application had been found acceptable on balance, but Members had reservations about these proposals.
 - b. Members' concerns regarding loss of the roof line and bay window in particular would have a negative impact on the character and setting of the area, and officers may consider an appropriate condition.
 - c. The advice of the Legal Services representative on the options available to the Committee.
 - d. Members considered that there were valid reasons to refuse planning permission.
- 7. A proposal that planning permission be refused on grounds that the proposed extensions would result in the loss of original architectural features (primarily the rear bay window and roof detailing) and this, together with the design and scale of the proposed extensions would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the property and therefore the Conservation Area in which it was located.
- 8. The vote of the majority of the Committee not to agree the officers' recommendation of approval of planning permission subject to conditions.
- 9. The support of the majority of the Committee for the proposal that planning permission be refused: 10 votes for and 5 abstentions.

AGREED that planning permission be refused for the reason below.

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of their size, siting and design, would result in the loss of architectural features intrinsic to the character and appearance of this property, and would result in a form and resultant scale of development that would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this property and its contribution to the Meadway Conservation Area in which it is located. In this respect the development would be contrary to Policies (II)C27 and (II)C30 of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Policy 31 of the Core Strategy, DMD 44 of the Submission version Development Management Document and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan.

324

SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL CONSTITUTION - TIME OF MEETING

AGREED that the rules of procedure within the Council's Constitution relating to the time meetings should end (10pm) be suspended for a period of 30 minutes to enable the business on the agenda to be completed.

325

P13-00751PLA - OLD PARK HOUSE, OLD PARK ROAD, LONDON, N13 4RD

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Head of Development Management, clarifying the proposal.
2. Receipt of three further representations, with the following concerns:
 - Cycle store is unnecessarily obtrusive, unsympathetic to surroundings and will spoil the amenity of the front garden at Raymond House.
 - No design specification has been provided concerning the cycle store.
 - A 27 cycle space facility would not fit in the suggested location.
 - Why does cycle store have to be securely housed?
 - If planning permission is granted, a planning condition should be included that seeks to locate an appropriate location for the cycle store.
 - There is inadequate external lighting to the access road and to the rear of Old Park House.
 - Viability of more car parking has not been considered in the officer report.
 - Structural competency of building to sustain additional loading from proposed development.
 - The maintenance and servicing strategy currently fails to provide safe and satisfactory conditions for the residents of Old Park House.
 - Inadequacy of current refuse storage arrangements.
3. One further planning condition was recommended by Traffic and Transportation relating to securing adequately dimensioned parking spaces for the additional three units.
4. Condition 10 in respect of revised siting of cycle storage was highlighted.
5. The deputation of Mr Oliver Burns, including the following points:
 - a. He was a leaseholder in Old Park House and was speaking on behalf of all the residents who were against this proposal.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.9.2013

- b. The dormers would spoil the lines and the architectural integrity of the building's classic 1930s design. This was unfair because leaseholders had purchased homes there because of the design.
 - c. It was particularly unfair on those who had top floor flats and would now have people living above in the roof space. Sitting rooms would be located above main bedrooms. New additions could not maintain the soundproofing.
 - d. The development phase would create dust, pollution, heavy vehicle access and a dangerous environment.
 - e. Floor to ceiling ratios in the new flats were inadequate to be habitable.
 - f. The wellbeing of existing residents and enjoyment of their homes counted for nothing. There would be a negative impact on the value of their properties. There were already maintenance and servicing concerns.
6. The response of Mr Phil Waind, architect and agent for the applicant, including the following points:
- a. He was also the architect for Raymond House, which was viewed for an architectural award.
 - b. The plans for Old Park House considered its character and the interface below, and there had been extensive negotiation with officers.
 - c. The development would be sympathetic, in keeping, and maintain the rhythm of the building elevations, and there would be sufficient light.
 - d. A management plan would be conditioned.
 - e. The development would need to meet building regulations.
 - f. Quality accommodation would be provided. Ceiling height would rise to 3.2m in the centre of the room, which would be striking and dramatic. Much needed housing would be provided without any detrimental impact.
 - g. The bike store would be a 21 cycle unit and would not be sited in front of Raymond House.
7. The statement of Mr Dennis Stacey, Chairman, Conservation Advisory Group (CAG), advising that the Group had been split in its view regarding acceptability of this scheme but he personally thought it acceptable.
8. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
- a. Officers' confirmation that the cycle store's position had not been confirmed, but it would not be as shown on the plans.
 - b. Members' concerns relating to changes on the road-facing frontage and officers' advice that views were broken by trees, and that CAG considered the regularity of the dormer roof lights to be key.
 - c. Elements considered unacceptable in the previous scheme had been removed.
 - d. Sympathy for leaseholders, emphasis of the importance of adhering to the plan, but support for new homes.
9. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 14 votes for and 1 vote against.

AGREED that subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to secure the matters outlined in the report, planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report and the additional condition below, for the reasons set out in the report.

Additional Condition

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.9.2013

The development shall not commence until details of the proposed parallel parking spaces complying with the parking standards adopted by the Local Planning Authority have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied and shall be maintained for this purpose.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with adopted Policy and does not prejudice conditions of safety or traffic flow on adjoining highways.

326

TP/11/1163 - 105 & 107, CHASE SIDE, ENFIELD, EN2 6NL

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, confirming that the application was presented to committee following deferral of a decision on 23 July 2013, that Members had made a site visit, and highlighting information from the applicant included in the note for Members and that the applicant did not propose to amend the scheme.
2. Debate and questions from Members, including the following:
 - a. Members' concerns that the proposal was too big and would be overbearing and, being in a corner position, would change the aspect of the road, and that the density was too high.
 - b. Officers' clarification regarding frontage of the building opposite.
3. A proposal that planning permission be refused on grounds that the density, scale, height, massing and siting of the building would result in a prominent and overbearing form of development detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The vote of the majority of the Committee not to agree the officers' recommendation of approval of planning permission subject to conditions.
5. The support of the majority of the Committee for the proposal that planning permission be refused: 13 votes for and 2 abstentions.

AGREED that planning permission be refused for the reason below.

1. The proposed development, given its density, scale, height, massing and siting on the back edge of the pavement would result in a prominent and overbearing form of development that would detract from the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies (II)GD3 and (II)C30 of the Unitary Development Plan, Core Policies CP30 and 31 of the Core Strategy, DMD6 and 37 of the Submission version Development Management Document and London Plan policies 3.4, 3.5 and 7.4.

327

P13-01704PLA - ARNOS FAMILY CENTRE, 321A, BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N11 1BA

NOTED

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24.9.2013

1. Introduction by the Head of Development Management, clarifying the proposal, and that the level of parking and the density were considered acceptable.
2. Member request that occupiers not be permitted to participate in the CPZ.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that subject to the completion of a Unilateral Undertaking, planning permission be granted, subject to future residents being excluded from applying for a permit to park within the CPZ, and subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

328

P13-01822PLA - 2, STONARD ROAD, LONDON, N13 4DP

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposal, and the planning history.
2. Receipt of one additional letter of objection raising the following issues:
 - Will add to congestion and parking problems.
 - This is an attractive building and should remain.
3. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

AGREED that subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the matters outlined in the report, planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

329

P13-01885PLA - 44, HILLSIDE CRESCENT, ENFIELD, EN2 0HR

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

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

330

P13-02250LBE - GRANGE PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL, WORLDS END LANE, LONDON, N21 1PP

NOTED the unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

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

331

APPEAL INFORMATION

NOTED the update on appeal decisions on planning applications between 3 June 2013 and 5 September 2013.

332

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that an additional meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on Tuesday 8 October 2013, 7:30pm, Enfield Civic Centre Conference Room.