

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 22 APRIL 2014**

COUNCILLORS

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

ABSENT Andreas Constantinides and Paul McCannah

OFFICERS: Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Linda Dalton (Legal Services), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager) and Geoff Burrage (Transport Planning & Policy) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

Also Attending: Approximately 10 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives
Dennis Stacey, Chairman – Conservation Advisory Group
Councillor Del Goddard, Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration
Councillor Bambos Charalambous and Councillor Joanne Laban (ward councillors)

956

WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT

NOTED

1. Councillor Simon, Chairman in the absence of Councillor Constantinides, welcomed everyone to the meeting.
2. Councillor Cranfield acted as Vice Chairman for the meeting.
3. The Legal Services representative read a statement regarding the order and conduct of the meeting.

957

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Constantinides and Councillor McCannah, and from Bob Griffiths, Assistant Director – Planning, Highways and Transportation.

958

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

959

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 25 MARCH 2014

AGREED the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 25 March 2014 as a correct record.

960

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION (REPORT NO. 243)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning, Highways and Transportation (Report No.243).

961

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.

962

P14-00291PLA - LAND TO THE REAR OF, SOUTHGATE TOWN HALL, 251, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 4XD

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals and confirming the objectives for the site set out in the Southgate Town Hall planning brief. The report noted concern about the allocation of parking spaces between the conversion scheme which would comprise all private market accommodation and the new build block, which would comprise all affordable housing, with only 3 spaces being allocated to the affordable housing. The total level of parking across the two schemes was considered acceptable, but it was recommended that the S106 Agreement, which was needed to link both planning applications together, also required the submission of a parking management plan so that officers could be satisfied that the allocation of parking spaces across the two developments allowed for their efficient use. Members should also note that the recently granted application for the works to the library to allow for its refurbishment and the creation of a health centre / doctors surgery, also included a condition requiring the submission of a parking management plan which could identify that some of the parking spaces included within that scheme can be made available to the residential occupiers outside library / surgery opening times.
2. Officers have requested a revised site location plan ensuring that the red line application site boundary extended to include the whole of the parking area and the entirety of the access to the site from Shapland Way.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22.4.2014

3. The deputation of Mr Stuart Dominguez, neighbouring resident, including the following points:
 - a. He considered there would be inadequate car parking spaces for the new development, coupled with the library and GP surgery.
 - b. Residents of Shapland Way and Davey Close were concerned there would be a detrimental effect on local parking, illustrated on a circulated map. Two areas marked were the only on-street parking areas, and had capacity for 6 and 5 cars respectively. The lack of parking for the development would have a knock-on effect on local residents' parking.
 - c. Workers on the town hall had been parking in Shapland Way and Davey Close, and residents feared this would start again.
 - d. Visitors to the GP surgery would arrive by car and also park in Shapland Way and Davey Close, causing resentment to residents.
 - e. He would urge the number of parking spaces to be increased, or the allocation of parking to be changed.

4. The statement of Councillor Bambos Charalambous, Palmers Green ward councillor, including the following points:
 - a. Both schemes being considered at this site were relevant to the development of Palmers Green Library and so were supported by the ward councillors.
 - b. He acknowledged the issues around parking. He hoped that traffic management measures would ameliorate the concerns of Shapland Way and Davey Close residents.
 - c. He noted that Southgate Civic Trust did not object to the proposals.
 - d. This was a good scheme and would provide much needed housing in the area.

5. The response of Mr Nick Langley, the applicant, including the following points:
 - a. Hollybrook was a family owned company.
 - b. The scheme would be a positive addition to this part of Palmers Green, would smarten up the area, and generate much needed economic activity.
 - c. Funding was in place and the scheme would commence this spring.
 - d. Affordable housing would be provided.
 - e. All possible had been done to satisfy officers' requirements, including on the design, layout and sustainability.
 - f. The parking survey had demonstrated that there was sufficient on-street parking in the area.
 - g. This was a well considered, well designed, policy compliant scheme.

6. Comments of the Transport Planning & Policy officer, advising that residential use would generate fewer trips than previous use, and that there would be complementary uses on the site. 15 extra parking spaces would be available overnight, outside library and GP surgery hours, through the management plan. The site was well located for public transport and facilities and there should not be an over demand on on-street parking. Spare capacity had been found within a 400m radius.

7. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22.4.2014

- a. Comments that availability of parking spaces for visitors to the GP surgery and library was important. There should be no residential parking in those spaces during the day time. It was confirmed that the level of parking for the surgery and library had been previously agreed under the relevant planning application. Operating hours were not yet known, but a management plan would deal with outside those hours.
 - b. Concerns about potential overspill parking, and that it was important to protect existing residents' parking in Shapland Way and Davey Close.
 - c. The comments of the Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration that GP surgeries in the south west of the borough were mainly in residential roads, without dedicated public parking; and that many library users walked. The South West Area Action Plan had also now been confirmed by the Planning Inspector, and numbers of school places were sufficient to meet housing developments.
 - d. Confirmation that amenity space provision met DMD standards. Members requested that compliance should be confirmed in the report.
 - e. Concern regarding the minimal parking provision of 3 spaces for the 18 residential units.
 - f. Officers' advice on the linked S106 legal agreement between the two schemes at the site, and opportunities to ensure appropriate parking allocation.
 - g. Members were equally concerned about the allocation of car parking between the private and affordable elements and asked that the parking management plan to be secured through the S106 Agreement ensure a more balanced distribution of spaces between the tenures.
8. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 8 votes for, 2 against and 3 abstentions.

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.

963

P14-00285PLA - SOUTHGATE TOWN HALL, 251, GREEN LANES, LONDON, N13 4XD

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposals. Parking for this element of the scheme would be provided to the site frontage (8 spaces) accessed from Green Lanes and a further 11 spaces to the rear accessed from Shapland Way. However, the report noted concern about the allocation of parking spaces between the conversion scheme which would comprise all private market accommodation and the new build block, which would comprise all affordable housing. The total level of parking across the two schemes was considered acceptable, but it was recommended that the S106 Agreement, which was needed to link both planning applications together, also required

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22.4.2014

the submission of a parking management plan so that officers could be satisfied that the allocation of parking spaces across the two developments allowed for their efficient use. The parking layout to the site frontage had been amended to ensure that the trees to the frontage were retained.

2. Officers have requested a revised site location plan ensuring that the red line application site boundary extended to include the whole of the parking area and the entirety of the access to the site from Shapland Way.
3. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
 - a. Concern in respect of allocation of parking spaces between the private and affordable elements; that the developer had provided one parking space per private unit, in contrast with the minimal allocation to the affordable housing units considered before. Members asked that the parking management plan to be secured through the S106 Agreement ensure a more balanced distribution of spaces between the tenures.
 - b. Confirmation of amenity space provision.
 - c. Confirmation by the Cabinet Member for Business & Regeneration that there had been minor modifications to the South West Area Action Plan in respect of school places provision, and the whole plan had been confirmed. He asked that a note be distributed to all Committee members for information.
4. The unanimous support of the Committee for the officers' recommendation.

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.

964

P14-00835PLA - 1 CHASE SIDE, ENFIELD, EN2 6NB

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, including:
 - a. Clarification of the proposals.
 - b. The property would originally have comprised a single family dwelling and therefore the removal of the dental surgery and its conversion back to living accommodation linked to the existing family house was considered acceptable.
 - c. The proposed ground floor extensions were limited in extent and effectively provided for the creation of a single flank wall along the line of the outermost extent of the existing bay window.
 - d. The first floor extension did not extend the property any deeper into the rear garden but extended the property sideways effectively squaring it off.
 - e. It was recognised that the property would increase in size when viewed from neighbouring properties. However, given the separation distance between the application property and the neighbouring properties to the

rear (approx. 16m) it was not considered that the development would result in either a loss of light or outlook.

f. A new window was proposed to the rear elevation of the first floor extension, to provide natural light to a new bedroom to be created within the extension. However, this bedroom would have a further window in the flank elevation facing the open space to the south and therefore it was considered reasonable to require that the window to the rear elevation was fixed and obscure glazed to a height of 1.7m above the floor level and a condition to this effect was recommended. It was considered with this condition the privacy of adjoining residents would not be compromised.

2. The deputation of Mr Bowring, neighbouring resident, including the following points:
 - a. He understood the new owner's desire to develop the property and wanted to be co-operative, but would like to register his concerns about the bulking and massing and the building line.
 - b. He contested the officers' description of the extension as 'modest'.
 - c. The building line was at an angle to his property, which meant the development would extend towards him.
 - d. There was a proposal to extend no.3 (application ref TP/02/0410) which was rejected on grounds of design and size and visually intrusive in the conservation area. That proposal was of a smaller size than this one.
 - e. This proposal would cause serious loss of amenity to Beauchamp Lodge and River View.
3. The response of Mr Ken Dufton, the applicant, including the following points:
 - a. Nothing being proposed was controversial. He wished to bring this property, which had been modified over a number of years, back into reasonable use, in a way that would enhance the appearance of the area.
 - b. The footprint of the building would not be extended to any great extent; the main impact was on the first floor..
 - c. New windows would be installed, but into an elevation which already had windows, and he accepted the condition regarding obscured glazing.
4. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
 - a. The application was presented to Planning Committee both because it was submitted by the Council's Plan Drawing Service, and because officers were aware of the local interest.
 - b. Confirmation of separation distances, and of the current and proposed plan and garden access, and that the proposals were policy compliant.
5. 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 reasons set out in the report.

965

P14-00190PLA - THE TRIANGLE, JUNCTION OF ALDERMANS HILL AND GREEN LANES, N13 4PH

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager, clarifying the proposal.
2. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
 - a. Confirmation that the site was on the eastern side of The Triangle.
 - b. Consultation would be undertaken on the 'Mini-Holland' proposals for the area at a later stage.
3. 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 reasons set out in the report.

966

P14-00041PLA - CAR PARK, RAYNHAM ROAD, LONDON, N18 2JF

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Head of Development Management, including:
 - a. Description of the proposals, with confirmation that they involved the loss of 26 spaces, not 25 as identified in the report, due to an additional space required because of widening of the access to facilitate two way working.
 - b. Other sites were considered by the applicant prior to choosing this site.
 - c. A range of compensatory measures had been prepared to mitigate the loss of parking, as set out at Para 4.1.2 in the report. These measures provided 21 additional on street spaces thereby resulting in a net reduction of 5 spaces.
 - d. Furthermore, all staff would be encouraged to use public transport to work. Some spaces had been acquired at the Orbital Business Park where parking for staff and visitors would be provided. As part of the staff induction, instruction not to park at Raynham Road at any time and to use alternative car parks would be given. Site security would carry out checks on staff vehicle registration numbers to ensure that no one used the car park. Deliveries would be into the site compound without any impact on the rest of the car park.
 - e. In addition to parking issues, Members also had to consider the impact on residential amenity and character. The temporary nature of the buildings offset the need to take into account long term design considerations.
2. Receipt of three further letters of objection, raising the following objections:
 - a. The use of the car park would affect their business (Private Tuition Services 1-19 Wakefield Street). Visitors, mainly parents and children, need to have short and easy access to parking.
 - b. There was already a lot of pressure on traffic during the evenings due to the nearby High Street, the Islamic Centre and the tuition school, Spurs

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 22.4.2014

- games – so will cause massive disruption of traffic for local people and surrounding businesses.
- c. The likely movements of heavy machinery and vehicles could be harmful to children and create an unpleasant situation.
 - d. Parking was already difficult with residents having to drive round for 15 / 20 minutes to find a parking space.
 - e. Raynham School had doubled pupil numbers in the last 10 years.
 - f. Roads were already congested.
 - g. Requests had been made by residents to the Council for controlled parking and so far no action had been taken.
3. Amendments to conditions:
- a. Condition 3 – fourth line delete “The Travel Plan shall be in place for the duration of the permitted use”.
 - b. Condition 4 – second line substitute date for “30th September”; and third line after car park insert “including surfacing and markings for car park layout”.
4. Members’ debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
- a. Discussion of the affect of loss of parking spaces in the car park for a temporary period balanced against the benefits of the refurbishment works on the A406. Consideration of additional potential parking spaces, and onus on TfL to minimise disruption. Officers confirmed that parking capacity was available in the area at most times except Fridays and Tottenham Hotspur home match days, and that the mitigation measures proposed were considered acceptable.
 - b. Concern that a bottleneck at the car park entrance could lead to tail-backs, and concern that shops and businesses may suffer loss of custom.
5. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers’ recommendation: 9 votes for, 3 against, and 1 abstention.

AGREED that subject to a unilateral undertaking to secure the package of transport mitigation measures outlined within the report, planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report and amendments above, for the reasons set out in the report.

967

P14-00573PLA - 1-64, BEALE CLOSE, LONDON, N13 6DH

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. 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 reasons set out in the report.

968

P14-00788REV - DEPOT, 7, MELLING DRIVE, ENFIELD, EN1 4BS

NOTED

1. The introduction by the Head of Development Management, including:
 - a. Planning permission for the redevelopment of this site was granted by Planning Committee in August 2013 with the decision being issued in October following the completion of discussions on the S106 agreement.
 - b. As part of these discussions, it became clear that the development which provides 100% affordable housing across a range of tenures, could not sustain the level of contributions that had previously been identified. In order to progress the development and ensure key development targets were met, planning permission was issued on the basis of the original valuations and contributions totalling in excess of £1m. However, it was agreed that a revised application could be submitted to reduce the level of contributions based on an open and up to date valuation.
 - c. This approach was consistent with Government advice in Para 205 of the NPPF that acknowledged Councils should not insist upon planning obligations which would render the development unviable.
 - d. The application had therefore been submitted with financial contribution of £750,000. There were no changes to the scheme itself.
 - e. The application was supported by a viability assessment which has been reviewed by the Council's independent viability consultant who concurs that this is the maximum level of contribution that can be sustained by the development.
 - f. In order to support commencement of development, £47,500 has already been paid. The allocation of the financial contribution was set out at Para 6.2.7 of the report.
2. Members' debate and questions responded to by officers, including:
 - a. Concern that developers should keep the agreements made.
 - b. Confirmation that the entire development was affordable housing, and that the Council had been involved in discussions regarding rent levels.
 - c. Confirmation of Government guidance, and that the viability had been externally reviewed, and advice on use of overage clauses.
 - d. Reservations of members in supporting the recommendation.
3. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation: 7 for, 5 against, and 1 abstention.

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

969

APPEAL INFORMATION

RECEIVED and NOTED the written report circulated by the Head of Development Management.

