

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON TUESDAY, 25 JANUARY 2011**

**COUNCILLORS**

**PRESENT** Andreas Constantinides, Toby Simon, Kate Anolue, Yusuf Cicek, Dogan Delman, Ahmet Hasan, Ertan Hurer, Nneka Keazor, Dino Lemonides, Paul McCannah, Terence Neville OBE JP, Anne-Marie Pearce, Martin Prescott and George Savva MBE

**ABSENT** Ali Bakir

**OFFICERS:** Linda Dalton (Legal Services), Debbie Addison (Legal Services), Andy Higham (Planning Decisions Manager), Steve Jaggard (Environment & Street Scene) and Aled Richards (Head of Development Management) Jane Creer (Secretary) and Kasey Knight (Secretary)

**Also Attending:** Approximately 25 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives.  
Dennis Stacey, Chairman of Conservation Advisory Group.  
Councillor Alan Sitkin.  
Dr Eliot Finer, Independent Member of Standards Committee.

**690**

**LONDON PLANNING AWARDS**

NOTED the Committee recorded their congratulations to the Planning Department and Sharon Davidson (Principal Planning Officer) in particular, on winning the Best Built Project award at this year's London Planning Awards for Enfield Town Library, and it was suggested that Sharon Davidson be invited to full Council meeting.

**691**

**WELCOME AND LEGAL STATEMENT**

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

**692**

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Bakir and from Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director, Planning & Environmental Protection).

**693**

**DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

NOTED

1. Councillor Simon declared a personal interest in application TP/10/1335 – 10, Saville Row, Enfield, as he had advised residents of Planning Committee procedures.
2. Councillor Neville declared a personal interest in application TP/10/1278 – 46, Cranleigh Gardens, London as he had requested that it be considered by the Planning Committee after having been contacted by the adjacent property owner.

**694**

**MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE 16 DECEMBER 2010**

NOTED the amendment to Minute 620 requested by the Planning Decisions Manager and the amendment to Minute 619 requested by Councillor Neville with the agreement of Councillor Simon.

**AGREED** the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 16 December 2010 as a correct record, subject to the amendments as above.

**695**

**REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (REPORT NO. 170)**

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning and Environmental Protection (Report No. 170).

**696**

**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.

**697**

**LBC/10/0035 - BOWES PRIMARY SCHOOL, BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N11 2HL**

NOTED

1. The two applications in respect of Bowes Primary School would be discussed together.
2. In respect of application LBC/10/0035, a letter had been received from English Heritage raising no objection.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011**

3. In respect of application LBE/10/0035, a letter of support had been received from Councillor Yasemin Brett, Bowes Ward Councillor and longstanding governor of Bowes School, read in full to the Committee.
4. The deputation of Mr Steven Williams, neighbouring resident of Stanley Road, including the following points:
  - a. The original proposals had minimal impact on neighbouring properties, but the additional parking restrictions in this application would have a substantial effect, and residents had not been consulted.
  - b. Nine households would no longer be able to park outside their homes in Stanley Road, and 209 Bowes Road would also be affected. It was already difficult to find a parking space in the vicinity and property values would fall.
  - c. Concerns about the look of bricked off garages alongside 209 Bowes Road.
  - d. The tree which shielded his view from the North Circular Road would be removed.
5. The statement of Councillor Alan Sitkin, Bowes Ward Councillor, including the following points:
  - a. He was also speaking on behalf of the school, and he supported the points made by Councillor Brett.
  - b. Bowes Primary School children had disproportionately few amenities and any measure to give them access to more playground space should be taken.
  - c. Further distancing of the children from the traffic and fumes was welcome.
  - d. He understood local residents had concerns regarding child noise, but considered traffic noise had a greater effect.
6. The advice of the Traffic and Transportation officer in respect of the extension of parking restrictions into Stanley Road, and confirmation that there was likely to be an additional loss of around six parking spaces in a heavily parked road, but on balance this was felt to be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.
7. The advice of the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of the Notting Hill Housing Trust owned property at 209 Bowes Road.
8. Members' support for tree planting within the new playground to replace lost street trees, and for the benefits of the scheme to the school children.
9. Members' unanimous support in favour of the officers' recommendations.

**AGREED** that following the expiration of the consultation period and subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and no objection being raised, planning permission be deemed to be granted in accordance with Regulation 4 of the Town & Country Planning (General) Regulations 1992, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reason set out in the report.

**LBE/10/0035 - BOWES PRIMARY SCHOOL, BOWES ROAD, LONDON, N11 2HL**

NOTED that the application was discussed in conjunction with application LBC/10/0035 and noted in Minute 697 above.

**AGREED** that in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning 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

No development shall take place until details of a scheme to introduce waiting restrictions around the turning head have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority: the approved details to be implemented in accordance with an agreed timescale.

Reason: To ensure the turning head remains unobstructed and available for use in the interests of highway safety.

**699**

**CAC/10/0008 - THE COTTAGE, 17, GAMES ROAD, BARNET, EN4 9HN**

NOTED

1. The two applications in respect of the site were discussed together, but voted on separately.
2. Two adjoining residents had written to advise that, notwithstanding their objections to the massing and scale of the development, the increasing gentrification of the area and inadequate provision of car parking, they had met with the developer and would be prepared to waive their objections if matters which they had agreed with the developer could be secured through planning condition.
3. Confirmation of the Planning Decisions Manager that further conditions would be added in consultation with local residents to cover the points raised.
4. The deputation of Mrs Margaret Redman on behalf of Monken Hadley Conservation Advisory Committee, including the following points:
  - a. This application was changed very little from the previous one.
  - b. The property fitted well into the area, together with the cottages opposite, on one of the oldest roads in England.
  - c. This development would be too big for the site, its height and depth would be detrimental to other properties, and there were concerns about how long the features would remain as fitted.
  - d. There would be a loss of garden space and trees which made the area delightful.
  - e. The Planning Inspector appeared to ignore the views of local residents and the developer had done nothing to lower the scheme's height and bulk.

5. The deputation of Mr Philip Redman on behalf of Chalk Lane Area Residents Association, including the following points:
  - a. They objected to the demolition of the property and replacement with a vast bulky building 2.5 times greater in footprint.
  - b. There may be 16 people living in the development and potentially at least 16 vehicles and visitors' cars. Parking provision would be inadequate, there was no parking availability in Games Road and the extra traffic would result in blockages and pollution.
  - c. The single exit/entrance was a potential hazard for emergency vehicles.
  
6. The response of Mr Colin Bull, neighbouring resident of Fairgreen East, including the following points:
  - a. He was speaking on behalf of residents of nos. 14, 16 and 18 Fairgreen East and no. 1 Games Road; the four properties that had boundaries with the development site.
  - b. They had concerns regarding the scale, parking provision and effect on visual amenities and views, but recognised the Planning Inspector's conclusions.
  - c. If approval was granted, he would want the plan agreed by residents and Banner Homes to be implemented and the suggested conditions to be followed through on, including screening by evergreens and not permitting floodlighting at the rear.
  
7. The response of Mr Neil Cottrell, Planning Manager, Banner Homes Ltd, including the following points:
  - a. He confirmed there had been very positive discussions with Mr Bull and the other neighbours and Banner Homes had no objections to their requests.
  - b. The appeals were dismissed on the unacceptable effect of the coach-house on 18 Fairgreen East. The Planning Inspector fully accepted the principle of demolition and replacement of the property.
  - c. The design and setting of the coach-house had been amended, and the development would preserve the character of the conservation area.
  - d. There was satisfactory parking provision and the proposals were acceptable from a highways viewpoint.
  
8. The Planning Decisions Manager's assurance that conditions would cover refuse storage and tree protection and consultation with local residents would take place in respect of the landscaping and external lighting.
  
9. The statement of Mr Dennis Stacey, Chairman of the Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) advising that the group had considered the site on a number of occasions and consistently advised that the side and rear elevations were too big. Though not locally listed, this was a charming building, appropriate in scale and setting in the area. The proposal would be out of keeping and should be rejected.
  
10. Members' discussion commending the developer and neighbouring residents for working constructively together, and recognising the principles established by the Planning Inspector's report.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011**

11. Officers' confirmation that the emergency service access, the extra traffic generation, and the density were considered satisfactory, and distance from the electricity substation was sufficient.

12. Councillor Simon's request for additional detail to break up the expanse of blank wall.

13. Councillor Delman's continuing concerns that the new proposal was only marginally different, would not enhance the conservation area and that the Council had strong grounds for rejecting this application.

14. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation; 10 votes for and 3 votes against.

**AGREED** that Conservation Area Consent be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report, for the reasons set out in the report.

**700**

**TP/10/0977 - THE COTTAGE, 17, GAMES ROAD, BARNET, EN4 9HN**

NOTED

1. The application was discussed in conjunction with the associated application CAC/09/0015 and noted in Minute 699 above.

2. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation, with amended and additional conditions; 10 votes for and 2 votes against with 1 abstention.

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

Amended Conditions

Condition 1 The development shall not commence until details of amended flank elevations to incorporate improved detailing and the external finishing materials to be used in the scheme 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 a satisfactory external appearance.

Condition 11 Notwithstanding the details shown on drawing number BAN 16934 09, 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 incorporate evergreens (for immediate screening) and indigenous species and 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.

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011

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.

### Additional Conditions

Condition 19 The development shall not commence until details of any external lighting proposed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved external lighting shall be provided before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the amenities of adjoining occupiers and / or the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

**701**

**TP/10/1547 - 6, BOURNE HILL, LONDON, N13 4LG**

NOTED

1. Receipt of an additional consultation response from Environmental Health advising they had no objection.
2. The deputation of Mr David Cooper, the agent, including the following points:
  - a. The description in the report incorrectly described the premises as a petrol filling station, which had not been the case for at least three years.
  - b. As part of the 2007 planning permission, a S106 Agreement was entered into and £23,000 paid to provide a pedestrian cross-over and road markings considered imperative at the time. This money had not been spent, the Council had failed to meet its part of the undertaking and it was wrong for this application to be resisted on highways grounds.
  - c. The business had functioned successfully during its period of operation; it managed a sequential flow of vehicles through the bays and there had been no accidents or road blockage. Members were welcome to visit and see the operation.
  - d. Noise levels had been checked by Environmental Health who confirmed there was no problem.
  - e. The applicant would provide barriers to restrict access when the site was full, and an electronic board could be installed if necessary.
3. The response of Mr Denis Mayer, local resident, including the following points:
  - a. There were outstanding issues regarding land ownership and boundaries.
  - b. The kiosk, garage and storage had gone and the site looked ugly in what was a beautiful residential area.
  - c. From his garden, the hoovers and power washers could be heard operating non-stop, and spray came over the walls.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011**

4. The response of Ms Pauline Monaghan, local resident, including the following points:
  - a. Every morning when she walked by she was unable to pass this site easily because of the number of cars there and she had to wait for them to move.
  - b. Soaping and pressure hosing spray went over the pavement and operators had to stop the hoses to let people pass.
  - c. Drying of cars took place on the pavement area because of the restricted space.
5. Members' concern in respect of the unspent S106 monies and advice of the Traffic & Transportation officer regarding an ongoing review of traffic issues in the wider area and that the Council had not wanted to bring the S106 scheme forward in isolation before this review was concluded.
6. Members' discussion regarding the business operation, ways of mitigating effects on local residents, traffic conditions in the area, and suggestions that the application may offer some improvement on the current situation.
7. Planning officers' advice, if Members were minded to approve the application, regarding conditions, which could be delegated to officers for rewording to take into account the residents' concerns. Officers agreed to amend conditions appropriately to deal with water spillage and noise.
8. Planning officers' confirmation that Environmental Health had raised no objection and the Public Health Team had received allegations but none were substantiated, and advice in respect of boundary walls.
9. The proposal that planning permission be approved, with reworded conditions, supported by a majority of the Committee, 9 votes for and 5 votes against.
10. Councillor Neville's request that concern regarding the S106 Agreement be referred to the appropriate Cabinet Member.

**AGREED** that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions delegated to Officers.

**702**

**TP/10/1278 - 46, CRANLEIGH GARDENS, LONDON, N21 1DS**

NOTED

1. In response to Members' queries, the Head of Development Management's advice regarding inspections of building works, and confirmation that in this instance the visit was made by an approved inspector rather than a Council Building Control officer, and that approved inspectors were self regulated.
2. Members' discussion, expressing disappointment that the application was retrospective, comments that it was in keeping with the street scene, but



**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011**

concerns regarding the impact on the adjacent property, and officers' advice regarding determination of this application, and on forthcoming legislation and the Localism Bill.

3. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation; 9 votes in favour, 2 against with 2 abstentions.

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

**703**

**TP/10/1335 - 10, SAVILLE ROW, ENFIELD, EN3 7LD**

NOTED that Members had made a very useful site visit on 8/1/11, and hoped that neighbours would be able to work together to enable the development to be built with minimum disruption.

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

**704**

**TP/07/1234/REN1 - COMMERCIAL PREMISES, 5, PICKETTS LOCK LANE, LONDON, N9 0AS**

NOTED

1. Confirmation that Lea Valley Regional Park Authority had no objection in principle but wished to be consulted on details regarding highway alterations.

2. In response to Members' queries, confirmation of the Traffic and Transportation officer that the service yard should accommodate turnover of vehicles on site and he was satisfied there should not be undue problems with HGVs parking or waiting. Condition 5 covered traffic management and required an approved travel plan and management plan.

3. In response to queries regarding materials to be processed, the Planning Decisions Manager's advice on the de-manufacturing proposed and that Condition 7 ensured that all storage and processing must be carried out inside the building, and that before the operation started a waste licence must be obtained from the Environment Agency which would ensure that appropriate processes were in place.

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

**705**

**TP/10/0911 - 33, LONDON ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 6DR**

NOTED

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011

1. An amendment to Condition 16 to remove the reference to guard railings, in the interest of street furniture de-cluttering.
2. Councillor Neville's reservations about the hotel operation and lack of catering provision, and the loss of potential office jobs.
3. The advice of the Head of Development Management that this would be a typical budget hotel, many of which did not provide restaurant facilities. That people would not be catered for would be good for the businesses of Enfield Town and there was a recognised shortage of hotel accommodation in the borough.
4. In response to discussion regarding possible use of the hotel as a hostel which was felt inappropriate for this location, agreement to a new condition controlling use.
5. The support of the majority of the Committee for the officers' recommendation; 12 votes for and 1 against.

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

### Amended Condition

Condition 16 The development authorised by this permission shall not commence until the applicant has entered into a Section 278 agreement under the Highways Act 1980 with the Council (as local planning authority and local highway authority) to secure the provision of a pick up / drop off lay-by to serve the development in accordance with a location and a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the defined Section 278 works shall be completed to the satisfaction of the local highway authority prior to occupation of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not prejudice the free flow and safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the adjoining highways.

### Additional Condition

The hotel element of the development hereby approved shall be occupied solely as a hotel within Use Class D2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and shall not be used for any other purpose whatsoever.

Reason: In order to ensure the use of the hotel element remains appropriate to its town centre location and supports the vitality and viability of the town centre.

**706**

**LBE/10/0033 - CRAIG PARK YOUTH CENTRE, LAWRENCE ROAD, LONDON, N18 2HN**

**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, for the reasons set out in the report.

**707**

**TP/10/1424 - CHASE SIDE WORKS, CHELMSFORD ROAD, LONDON, N14 4JN**

NOTED

1. Receipt of two additional letters of objection from neighbours, listing concerns including inadequate separation from existing properties, does not meet distancing standards, excessive height, balconies affecting privacy, overbearing, out of keeping in the street scene, inadequate parking provision, and poor design.
2. Receipt of an objection from Councillor Bambos Charalambous, Palmers Green Ward Councillor, raising concerns including insufficient distancing, the height and mass represented overdevelopment, not in keeping with the area, loss of privacy, and pressure on local public services.
3. Members' discussion in respect of the impact on parking.
4. Councillor Delman's proposal, seconded by Councillor Prescott, that the decision be deferred to give Members the opportunity to make a site visit to assess parking, amenity space, bulk and size, and impact on neighbouring properties, supported by a majority of the Committee; 7 votes for and 6 against with 1 abstention.

**AGREED** that consideration of the application be deferred to allow Members to make a site visit.

Reason: In order to enable Members to review the relationship / scale of the development to neighbouring properties and to assess levels of on street parking.

**708**

**APPEAL INFORMATION**

NOTED the information on town planning appeals received from 03/12/2010 to 31/12/2010, summarised in tables. Full details of each appeal were available on the departmental website.

**709**

**SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS - MONITORING INFORMATION (REPORT NO. 171)**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.1.2011**

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director (Place Shaping) (Report No. 171).

NOTED that the Chairman had asked for the report to be resubmitted to the next meeting of the Planning Committee, as the information had been reproduced incorrectly in the printed agenda pack and Members would like to see other information included within the appendix.

**710**

**COUNCILLOR NEVILLE**

NOTED that Councillor Neville would no longer be a Member of the Planning Committee, and the Chairman's thanks for his contribution to the Committee.