

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2014**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Abdul Abdullahi, Lee Chamberlain, Dogan Delman, Christiana During, Ahmet Hasan, Jansev Jemal, Derek Levy (Vice-Chair), Anne-Marie Pearce, George Savva MBE and Toby Simon (Chair)

ABSENT Suna Hurman and Andy Milne

OFFICERS: Bob Griffiths (Assistant Director - Planning, Highways & Transportation), Andy Higham (Head of Development Management), Sharon Davidson (Planning Decisions Manager), Geoff Burrage (Transport Planning & Policy) and Izabella Grogan (Legal Services) and Metin Halil (Secretary)

Also Attending: Approximately 12 members of the public, applicants, agents and their representatives
Dennis Stacey, Chairman – Conservation Advisory Group

243

WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Simon, Chair, welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the order of the meeting.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hurman and Councillor Milne.

244

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

245

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 21 OCTOBER 2014

AGREED the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Tuesday 21 October 2014 as a correct record.

The Head of Development Management reminded members that at the Full Council meeting on the 19 November 2014, the Development Management Document (DMD) had been adopted. This now supersedes the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). At the time of writing the reports, both DMD and

UDP policies had been referred to, but the UDP references should now be ignored.

246

ORDER OF AGENDA

AGREED that the order of the agenda be varied to accommodate Councillor McGowan's deputation, as he had another meeting to attend to. The minutes follow the order of the meeting.

247

REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PLANNING, HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION (REPORT NO. 124)

RECEIVED the report of the Assistant Director, Planning, Highways and Transportation (Report No.124).

248

14/02821/FUL - 21 ARBOUR ROAD, ENFIELD, EN3 7TX

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. The application property comprises a two storey end of terrace house which has been extended to the side with a two storey extension and into the loft, resulting in a 5 bedroomed property.
3. The application proposes the conversion of the property to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) for 7 residents. Each resident would have a bedroom with en-suite shower room. A communal kitchen would be available, through which access would be available for all residents to the rear garden.
4. Policy DMD 5 relating to residential conversions and HMO's identifies a number of criteria that need to be met. These relate to providing a high quality form of accommodation through meeting internal floor space standards set down in the London Plan; and not harming the residential character of an area or resulting in an excessive number of clustering of conversions. In this respect the policy identifies a requirement of no more than 20% converted properties in a road, and no more than 1 in 5 in a consecutive row of properties.
5. The policy also seeks to ensure that there would not be an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance and that adequate provision is available for parking and refuse storage.
6. Members attention was drawn to the following:
 - There were no other conversions in the road.
 - The accommodation would meet the internal space standards for bedrooms. There is no communal living room but a large communal kitchen.
 - The existing property has 5 bedrooms and therefore the level of occupation would be similar.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.11.2014

- One parking space would be available on the existing forecourt. Traffic and Transportation are satisfied any further demand could be absorbed on the street.
 - Refuse facilities would be provided in the front garden in the form of 1 large refuse bin and 1 mixed recycling bin. Waste Services have confirmed this was acceptable.
7. The statement of Councillor Don McGowan, Ponders End Ward Councillor.
 8. The response of Mr Kyriakos Hajikyprri, the applicant.
 9. Members expressed concerns about the following issues:
 - Cycle storage and the number of cycles that could be stored.
 - No specific parking provision regarding HMO's.
 - Suspicion that if application was agreed, there would be 14 people living in the property as opposed to 7, which could lead to overcrowding.
 - Request for further conditions through a Section 106 agreement regarding the landlord informing the Council, on a yearly basis, who is living in the property and on car ownership so tenants are not car owners.
 10. Advice of the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of issues raised.
 11. Following a debate, a vote was taken and the officers' recommendation was supported by a majority of the committee: 8 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

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

249

P14/00512/PLA - SOUTHGATE OFFICE VILLAGE, MULTI STOREY CAR PARK, CHASE ROAD, LONDON, N14 6HF

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. This application site comprises the multi-storey car park that serves Southgate office village. The office village comprises a series of 3 storey detached office blocks served off a cul-de-sac accessing to Chase Road. The car park is located at the end of the cul-de-sac and presents a frontage to Park Road.
3. The application proposes the creation of a new floor of office accommodation and two floors residential accommodation above the existing top level of car parking. The present parking level would be retained and sit underneath the additional floors to be constructed. The village presently has access to 102 parking spaces and the proposal would result in the loss 5, leaving 97 to serve the existing floor space plus the new accommodation to be provided through this application.

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.11.2014

The application proposes 504sq.m of office floor space and 8 flats – 6 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed.

4. The new accommodation is set away from the flank wall of No.20 Park Road by 11m for the office level and 14m for the residential levels. There are windows in the flank elevation and terraces facing towards No.20 Park Road serving the residential units. The majority of the windows face the blank wall of No.20 and those that extend beyond the rear elevation can be obscure glazed and this can be secured by condition. The terraces would have 1.8m high privacy screens enclosing, and again this could be secured by condition.
5. The new office level of accommodation would align with the existing front wall of the car park and the residential accommodation would be set back by 2.2m. This gives a separation distance of 13.5m and 15.7m respectively from the 'warehouse' development on the opposite side of the street. However, it should be noted that the new development does not directly face this building, but is positioned slightly to the south of it.
6. The application has been supported by a sunlight and daylight report. This assesses the impact of the proposed development on sunlight and daylight in accordance with the Building Research Establishment publication 2011 "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight. A Guide to Good practise". This concludes that there would be no demonstrable impact on sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties as a consequence of the development.
7. Members to note that the officer assessment of the application concludes that the development is acceptable in terms of its relationship to the street scene, neighbouring properties and car parking. However, policy seeks to ensure that all residential developments make a contribution towards affordable housing and that for schemes of less than 10 units, this is in the form of an off-site contribution. If a developer considers that a contribution cannot be paid, then this needs to be evidenced in the form of a viability assessment. A considerable amount of time has been spent by the Council's independent consultant discussing the viability of this scheme. It is his view that the development can viably make a contribution of approx. £232k towards affordable housing, almost £25k towards education provision, monitoring fees and mayoral CIL. The applicant is proposing no contribution.
8. The applicant has now lodged an appeal against the Council's failure to determine the application within the statutory period. This means that the Council no longer has the authority to determine this application. However, the purpose of this report is to seek Members endorsement to a recommendation of refusal on the basis of the failure of the development to make the necessary contributions to affordable housing and education which we consider are viable. However, Members are free to consider whether they agree with this recommendation and/or whether there are other reasons for which they would have refused planning permission.
9. One further objection from the occupier of Flat 17, The Warehouse, 7 Park Road:

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.11.2014

- Object to a 4 storey build requesting a car park and flats on the first to third floors. This will take the current level height restrictions above that of the house situated on park road. The planning should not go beyond this height.
 - This will have a detrimental effect of the current enjoyment of my flat, situated opposite the site.
 - I do not object to the building of the flats, but the development should be restricted to the 2nd floor.
10. The deputation of Ms Sue Appell, neighbouring resident.
 11. The response of Ms Caroline Apcar, Apcar Smith Planning, agents to the applicant.
 12. Advice of the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of issues raised.
 13. Following a debate, a vote was taken on whether Members agreed with the officers' recommendation that the only issue with the application was the Section 106 agreement relating to housing and education provision, and this was unanimously approved. The LPA's appeal statement would be drafted accordingly.

AGREED that, in the absence of the appeal against the Council's failure to determine the application within the statutory period, had the Council been in a position to determine the application, it would have refused planning permission for the reason set out in the report.

250

14/03667/RE4 - CAFE & BOWLES GREEN, TOWN PARK, 1 CECIL ROAD, ENFIELD, EN2 6LE

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. This application relates to the café and bowls club building within Town Park. The bowls club themselves have vacated the building (Oct/Nov 2013). The Park is located within the Enfield Town Conservation Area.
3. The proposal involves the expansion of the café into the space previously occupied by the bowls club, together with the use of the bowling green as ancillary outside space for seating. An existing conservatory addition is to be demolished.
4. The application originally included the provision of steps and an access ramp. However objections were raised to this by Conservation Advisory Group (CAG) and therefore this element had been removed from the application.
5. Due to the siting of the building within the park, away from residential boundaries, use of the building itself as a larger café is unlikely to generate noise/disturbance issues for residents. The bowling green does however lie closer to the northern residential boundary and use of this for outdoor space for the café could be potentially more sensitive, dependent on hours of use and the type of activity taking place. The

application at this stage is for the use of the building ancillary to the park and therefore it would operate within normal park opening times. However, if a potential occupier want to operate the premises beyond park hours, for independent functions, then the LPA would have, at that stage, have the opportunity to consider the implications of such a use on adjoining residents, as they would need to apply to vary the terms of this condition.

6. Councillor Simon declared that, having seen the aerial shots of the development site, he lived on the eastern edge of the Town Park and did not consider it as a pecuniary interest.
7. The statement of Dennis Stacey, Chair, Conservation Advisory Group.
8. Members' discussion, noting the removal of the dis-abled ramp and that the café would not be able to operate without suitable disabled access and changes to condition 2 stating that the café and bowling green were ancillary functions to Town Park and should be operated during the Parks normal opening hours.
9. Following a debate, the officers' recommendation was unanimously approved.

AGREED that planning permission be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to an amendment to the wording of condition 2 so it reads:

The café (including the café and bowling green) hereby approved shall only be used to provide an ancillary function to the Town Park and only operate during the Parks normal opening hours and shall not be used as an independent function facility.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties; to ensure the development meets adopted car parking standards and preserves highway safety; to protect the character of the existing park and Conservation Area.

251

14/03718/RE4 - PONDERS END POLICE STATION, HIGH STREET, ENFIELD, EN3 4EZ

NOTED

1. Introduction by the Planning Decisions Manager.
2. The application site comprises the site of the former Ponders End Police Station, now demolished. The application proposed the erection of a single storey building on the site for a temporary period of two years, to provide a community facility catering for a variety of functions that would primarily be organised by local community groups and businesses – meeting facilities, training events, promotional events for local businesses and a pop up cinema. The building would be run by the Ponders End Community Development Trust and Enfield

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 25.11.2014

- Community Aid. Five parking spaces would be provided on site, including 2 disabled spaces, utilising the existing point of access.
3. The site is identified for a wider mixed use/residential redevelopment. Until this time, the proposal will make use of the site and could make a positive contribution to community facilities in the locality.
 4. One further objection was reported:
 - Enfield council seems to have managed to slip a planning application past the residents who in the main will be affected.
 - Is this a building to house meetings backed by the Ponders End Islamic centre. It is hidden as a centre serving the community but it is either by the aforementioned centre or party venues springing up all over the borough.
 - There is no way any additional traffic can be managed in this road. It will stop the major highway dead.
 5. Advice of the Planning Decisions Manager in respect of issues raised.
 6. Following a debate, the officers' decision recommendation was unanimously approved.

AGREED that planning permission be granted in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 subject to conditions set out in the report.

252

PLANNING PANELS

NOTED

The Head of Development Management reported that in light of the Chase Farm Hospital Planning application, there was a need to hold a planning panel in order that residents could voice their concerns.

A provisional date of Wednesday 7 January 2015 had been identified.

Due to other large applications there would also be additional committee meetings in February (date to be agreed) and 12 March 2015.

This was also Geoff Burrage's (Group Leader, Transportation Planning) last Committee meeting as he was leaving the Council. The Head of Development Management thanked him for his hard work and input at committee meetings.