

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING PANEL
HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 APRIL 2015**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Lee Chamberlain, Christiana During and Derek Levy

ABSENT

OFFICERS: Andy Higham (Head of Development Management) and Ned Johnson (Environment and Street Scene)

Also Attending: Applicant (Powerleagues) representatives:

Tony Scott
Ben Kelly (Wildstone Planning)
Kieran Gayler – (Sharp Redmour – Noise Consultants)

Ward Councillors: Cllr Bernie Lappage, Councillor Alev Cazimoglu (Jubilee Ward)
And approximately 15 members of the public / interested parties

**1
OPENING**

NOTED

1. Councillor Chamberlain as Chair welcomed all attendees and introduced the Panel Members.
2. The purpose of the meeting was to receive a briefing on the proposals, to provide local residents and other interested parties the opportunity to ask questions about the application and for the applicants, officers and Panel Members to listen to the reactions and comments. These views, and all the written representations made, would be taken into account when the application was determined by the Planning Committee.
3. This was not a decision-making meeting. A decision on the application would be made by the full Planning Committee in June 2015.

**2
OFFICERS' SUMMARY OF THE PLANNING ISSUES**

NOTED

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

Andy Higham, (Enfield Council Head of Development Management) introduced officers present and highlighted the following points:

1. This Planning Panel meeting was an important part of the consultation process. Notes were being taken and would be appended to the report to the Planning Committee.
2. This was an outline planning application, seeking to establish the principles of the uses and development of the site. Matters of detailed design and layout were not for consideration at this stage. The application proposed the construction of 7 Multi Use Games Area's (MUGA's) all enclosed by 5m high fences and being floodlit. The application also proposed a part single, part 2 storey detached sports pavilion together with parking and access. The proposal had now been amended, following a meeting, with the licensing facility now omitted from the proposals.
3. The Planning Committee could consider material planning issues. The key issues included:
 - Use of the playing fields and loss of open space.
 - The visual impact of the development.
 - The impact of the development on the amenities on neighbouring and nearby residential properties, noise, disturbance and illumination. The hours of opening could also be a factor.
 - Parking access and the effects of highway safety on surrounding roads.
 - The accuracy of noise mitigation measures proposed.
 - The effect of security on neighbouring residential properties.
 - The effects of surface water drainage and aswell as the effects of tress and ecology.
4. This was not an exhaustive list but highlighted the scope of issues that could be taken into account. What could not be considered, as part of this application, was the effect on the value of properties, which is often raised. When assessing this application, there is also a need to be mindful of guidance of the National Planning Policy which applicates presumption in favour of allowing developments which are consistent with adopted policy. The Council has a Local Plan which contains a number of policies, which are key, when assessing proposals. This would form the basis of planning's assessment.
5. The consultation period would be extended. If residents had further comments or required further clarification, then these should be sent to the Council by Friday 24 April, to be included in the report to Planning Committee.

3 PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT / AGENT

NOTED

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

Tony Scott (Applicant – Power league) introduced representatives of the applicant present and set out the proposals as follows:

1. Tony Scott would talk about the background to the application and then move onto things that had changed from the original proposal in terms of the public meeting that had been held, at the school, a few weeks ago. The proposal had been changed and moved around so as to help the proposal with some technical solutions.
2. The School had been looking at their sports facilities and how they could improve their facilities in conjunction with the Council. The Council undertook an exercise in terms of what could be done and achieved within the space available. The Council undertook a tender process where it was envisaged that operators would come up with proposals and schemes that would potentially be suitable for the school, the local community and for the operator's themselves', in terms of a viable commercial business.
3. The site had already gone through a Section 77 process, whereby the Secretary of State's office scrutinise the Section 77. It is designed to protect playing field land and anything that transpires is reviewed under this process. It was approved, at that level, in terms of the proposals sport, leisure and its current use as a playing field.
4. Power League (PL) had been successful in the tender process. The key factors being the sports hall itself, which the school had a great need for given the state of their sports facilities.
5. Power Leagues operated facilities on another 11 sites around the country. The nearest facility to the present site was Compton School in Barnet. Further facilities could be found in Milton Keynes and Mill Hill, which also operate on school sites. The schools' themselves have full exclusive access to the facilities, during the day and on evenings and weekends the facilities are operated by Power Leagues on a pay and play basis. There would also be a free community use scheme with the donation of pitch time. Power Leagues had a proven track record in terms of engagement with communities, with numerous references available as regards this.
6. The original application was agreed with the school and submitted at the end of 2014. Officers then requested further information on some of the key issues. A public meeting was held, at the school, in February 2015, where many of the residents present had attended. The key areas of concern that arose were:
 - Acoustic levels
 - Lighting
 - Parking
 - Anti-Social behaviour
 - Licensing aspect of the original application

The Council then undertook some door to door consultation with local residents so as to encourage people to a public meeting. Transpiring from the school public meeting, PL had internal discussions regarding all points raised and how they could change/amend things to try and help the development by addressing all concerns raised.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

7. A key issue raised by residents was that the original application had a licensing aspect which has been reviewed and have removed that aspect from the application. In terms of acoustic values presented in reports, further measurements had been taken at 3 different locations within the site at the request of residents. A noise consultant from Sharp Redmour (Mr Kieran Gayler) had been invited to the panel meeting to talk about those further measurements. Landscaping and lighting were also being looked at again by PL. The school then sent a letter out with regards to the outcomes of the school public meeting.
8. The development comprised of a full size playing pitch, 6 smaller pitches, a sports hall and associated facilities. An aerial shot of the site itself was presented on screen using a power point slide.
9. Tony Scott clarified that there was concern for a particular original drawing that wasn't clear about the development site. He explained the site area making clear the outline of the development site from the school. In terms of visibility, he pointed out where the new landscaped and planting out areas would be in relation to the development and residents homes.
10. Even though acoustic values fell within the guidelines available to PL, they have decided to include an acoustic barrier, outlined in red on their presentation plan. It would be a 2m high barrier to further mitigate any noise from the facility.
11. The development plan also included a covered cycle parking area, for dual use with the school (during school hours). As a result of the removal of the licensing aspect, the footprint of the building (sports hall) has been slightly reduced. There would also be 2 general purpose rooms that have been added within the sports hall which the school could use as additional class rooms for pupils and PL could use for children's parties. To reduce visual impact, the sports hall would be located as close to existing school buildings as possible.
12. The pitches would be an open style green synthetic, including fencing and soft netting which both have through visibility properties. Through discussion, everything within the development would be powder coated in green, but would require dialogue with officers as regards the flood light columns.
13. There would be no tree removal on site and PL would be adding trees and landscaping.
14. There would be two different heights of flood lights. The full size pitch would have a 12m high column, normally 15m high but the lighting scheme PL have used still provides the correct lighting with 12m columns. The smaller pitches would have 8m flood light columns. They would be downward pointing with very little spillage. The lighting model shown, traced around the actual spillage and within 10m, lighting spillage dropped down to that of street lighting. In terms of light spillage no residential properties would be affected.
15. Noise was a consideration that PL looked at seriously as a general rule as these facilities operated within local communities. Forty metres (40m) was an adequate buffer and depended on the ambient noise of a particular site. Every site had to be looked at on its own merits and that was why PL employed Sharp Redmour (noise consultants) to look at

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

noise on their behalf. They advised PL on suitable and unsuitable locations with regards to acoustic values. They had undertaken a noise impact assessment on the school site and further survey work was carried out as an outcome of the recent school public meeting. PL had also voluntarily added more mitigation measures to the application.

16. Kieran Gayler (Sharp Redmour) – His company are instructed by PL, who pay their bill. They write an assessment which then goes for scrutiny review by the Council and a noise report is submitted with the application. They do not work for PL but are independent noise consultants and had been in business for 25 years. There were 2 ways in which Sharp Redmour assessed noise:
 - a. Against a set of guideline values which are derived from the World Health Organisation (WHO) and other advisory bodies commonly used in noise assessments. Their levels related to health impacts and nuisance levels below which impact is seen to be negligible or not significant.
 - b. They looked at, not only what the absolute level is against those guidelines, but also, at how that level compares to what's already in the noise environment, as it is now. The original assessment was based on a measurement location at the edge of the school field, representative of properties on the other side of the railway line (east of development). Subsequently, it was raised by certain residents whether measurements could be taken at their properties. So, a further 3 locations were measured at or around these properties to obtain the existing noise environment as it is now without the facility.
 - c. Sharp Redmour then took those additional measurements and compared those to noise that they predict from the facility (based on measured values from other similar sites) and input these into computer models which are widely used with powerful software that is used to predict noise.
17. Kieran Gayler presented a sound map noise plan of the development area and clarified information shown on the graph:
 - The solid blue line was a typical average level of noise over a period of time.
 - The blue dotted line (underneath) is what is predicted as continuous noise from the facility.
 - The red line (at the top of graph) is the maximum level of noise, depicted as a discreet series of peaks of noise over time.
 - The red dashed line (underneath) is governed by the same index that was used to predict noise from the facility.Both those predicted levels were found to be below the threshold values from the WHO guidelines and also below the existing noise environment. The noise wouldn't necessarily be audible, but what the graph showed was that the noise level from the facility is compliant with WHO guideline values and was below the level of noise that was already experienced in those locations. The same assessments applied also for those locations at Norman Close.
18. The original assessment was based on an open, no mitigation scenario. This was discussed and agreed that an acoustic barrier

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

would be added all the way along the edge of the playing pitches. The advantage there would be that the barrier would be as close to the noise source as possible and provide better screening. It would be a solid barrier with boards up to 2m high.

19. The operating hours as put forward in the current application were as follows:

- Sunday – 10:00am – 22:30pm
- Monday – 16:30pm – 22:30pm
- Tuesday – 17:30pm – 10:30pm
- Wednesday – 16:30pm – 22:30pm
- Thursday – 17:30pm – 22:30pm
- Friday – 17:00pm – 22:00pm
- Saturday – 09:30am – 21:30pm

The facility will stop pitch use at 22:30pm, with the facility closing at 23:00pm. Except on Friday and Saturday, where the facility will close at 22:00pm and 21:30pm respectively.

The closing times relate to switch off time of floodlights and clearing of pitches, with everyone off site by 23:00pm. Pitches that are not being used have their floodlights switched off with a managed reduction in the number of pitches in use, so that the latest ones are on pitches furthest away from residencies.

20. Community access of the facility will be limited to weekends where donated pitch time would be at the following times:

- Saturday – 10:00am – 17:00pm
- Sunday – 10:00am – 18:00pm

21. In terms of the commercial viability of the scheme, this was a significant investment by PL and biggest single facility investment in terms of capital with a £2.5m investment. PL have to make the capital investment work, hence the smaller pitches, utilising the bigger pitch and commercial activity of the sports hall. There was an impact to PL, with the removal of the licenced premises, in terms of income re-generation. Therefore pitch playing times become very relevant in terms of commercial viability of the development itself.

22. In terms of parking and traffic movements, the following was advised:

- PL operated 47 sites nationwide and they had excellent data available in terms of traffic movements, to and from the facility.
- The pitches themselves would have staggered times of use and there would never be a huge influx or exit of users/vehicles.
- PL had prepared technical argument with regards to traffic movements and presented these to officers. Transport for London (TfL) had raised no issues with PL proposals in terms of their information.
- A further request from Enfield highways officers regarding a more up to date survey which had now been provided.
- Because the facility operates in the evenings, the vast majority of traffic movements would actually occur out of peak rush hour times.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

- There were currently 88 parking spaces on-site. In terms of calculations made with regards to that, there would be one vehicle arriving at the facility approximately every 1.3 minutes and a vehicle exiting every 1.25 minutes.
- The school bin store had been re-located so as to improve the tracking of the car park for refuse vehicles/collections for the school.
- In addition, there would be 32 covered bicycle parking spaces which could be utilised for the school, during the day. An optional 10 further spaces could be added to the 32 spaces, with the approval of council officers.
- Comments had been raised regarding the facility and anti-social behaviour. There were a number of surveys available in terms of sport combatting anti-social behaviour born out by Sport England, the Football Association, etc.

4

QUESTIONS BY PANEL MEMBERS

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

1. Q. With regards to the noise barriers and measurements taken, what is the normal line (graph figures) compared with i.e. a music concert, people within the school playground? Can a practical reference point be provided to show what 75DB for example, equates to i.e. boiling kettle, car alarm?
A. A noise measurement of 140DB for example would need to be put into context because there is often no measurement about how far away you are. Noise dissipates with distance. An example from the noise surveys that were carried out, for Lathkill Close, showed that the existing sort of ambient average levels here are dictated mostly by road traffic and railway noise and noise levels were in the region of 55-60DB. This was referred to as the blue line on the sound map graph. So for residents, these are the levels they are experiencing presently from general ambient noise in their gardens. This was the best context to set it to.
2. Q. Would the 55-60DB ambient noise level also include noise from the school when the playing field is being used?
A. No, they are evening levels, because we are looking at the impact in the evening time, when commercial use comes into play. At the bottom of the sound plan graph there were times that the survey was taken, which were between 17:00pm – 22:00pm at those residencies. The noise levels ranged between 55-60DB in the evening and this was the existing general road traffic noise level.
Noise from the facility was in the high 40DB less than the ambient noise level and not as loud as road traffic levels. That didn't mean that it won't be audible, but it was at a lower level to what was already being experienced. Yes, it is a different character of noise, except that had already been taken account of in the assessment and the guideline codes that are applied. The predicted levels were quite significantly below what the existing noise climate already is.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

3. Q. As a private, profit driven company, what have you in mind now to input into school area which you are using? How is the school going to profit from all this development?

A. The facility itself is exclusive to the school during school hours. This includes state of the art external pitches, sports hall and associated facilities. So the school benefits from the facilities themselves and being able to use and adapt those in their curriculum for sports activities. Much of the school playing areas include grassed playing fields which are not available for much of the year. So for much of the year pupils are contained in quite a small area in relation to play times. Having an all-weather pitch there suddenly means, pupils can use play areas all year round and is a huge benefit to the school.

4. Q. How is the development going to impact on nearby residents? What level of consultation did the applicant exercise so as to let residents accept the real development that is need in the area?

A. The process of consultation was led by the Council in terms of the need for school sports facilities and was part of a public tender process regarding that. PL had put together a scheme as part of that tender process, which was presented and was successful. The public consultation aspect of that came about after that tender process. The Council hadn't put that out to residents and unfortunately PL were not party to that, only with the tender. When it became apparent that this wasn't the case, PL immediately engaged and elected members also engaged in that process.

5. Q. Regarding the ownership of the land, has that been transferred to PL?

A. No, it's a 20 year lease.

6. Q. Essentially, PL are replacing a greenfield site with astro turf. What does that involve in terms of removal of existing soil?

A. Because the site itself is not fully level, there will be an element of 'cut and fill' in terms of some materials removed. Some of the soil will be used to level other parts of the site and landscaping, in terms of intrusive works. For the pitches themselves, about 300mm in terms of base work and then built up with a stone layer and the pitch on top of that. Some material will be removed.

7. Q. What sort of flow of vehicles can be expected i.e. diggers, trucks, etc.

A. The build process for the pitches would be approximately 12-14 weeks which entails various stages. The heavy plant equipment will be used initially for 2 weeks in terms of preparation. This will be during normal working hours and follow health & safety aspects of that. Ideally, PL would try and use heavy plant during school holidays and to begin the development during the holidays. There is to be a condition applied involving a construction management plan which would show the flow and routes vehicles would take.

The panel also requested that when the application came to planning committee, PL should provide everyday examples of comparisons of vehicle flows during construction and in clear view of what is reasonable.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

8. Q. Access into and from the development would follow the position of the car park, the school uses now, from the southbound side of the A10. Is this correct?
- A. Yes, and there won't be any changes to that.

5

QUESTIONS BY WARD COUNCILLORS

NOTED the following question's from Councillor's Bernie Lappage and Alev Cazimoglu, Jubilee Ward Councillor's.

1. Q. The Councillors were concerned about the recollection around the consultation with the public. The ward councillors were sure that they had asked for the public meeting at the school and also for this planning panel meeting, as it was important that people had the opportunity. Based on that kind of perception of a relationship with residents, how would PL see their relationship moving forward with the residents? How would that pan out i.e. noise monitoring? What will happen if the things PL have stated do not happen or if the noise levels are different to what PL have reported?
- A. In terms of noise, if that was the case, PL would have further noise measurements as regards to that. The measurements are taken at the physical sites PL operate, so the noise values that are expected to be produced are very accurate.
In terms of community engagement, PL has a proven track record with community engagement. If a resident has concerns, there is a full time professional management team on site that operates the facility and would engage with residents and their concerns.
2. The Ward Councillors had actually met with the Chief Executive, because they had concerns about the development and on that basis officers then went round and spoke to residents at their homes for their views. From that point of view, the councillors could not see relationship evidence.
3. Q. Referring to the alcohol license that was removed from the application, can PL provide a commitment and cast iron guarantee that they would not be looking to re-apply for the license at a later date? Can planning put in place a condition where PL could be prevented from applying for an alcohol license in future?
- A. The application has to be assessed, on its merits as it stands. Conditions can be instructed around use, but there is no guarantee that something can't be applied for in future. Licensing was a separate process of planning and conditions can't be imposed that would overlap with other legislation. The planning committee cannot grant a license. A licensing application can be made and a premises

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

can be granted even if planning permission has not been granted and vice versa.

4. Q. What is PL commitment and guarantee that they won't come back in 6 months/year and apply for a license? Have they included that in their business model proposals?
 - A. In terms of the business model itself, the answer is yes. In terms of a future license application, Tony Scott could not answer as this would be a board decision. But, in terms of the business model itself and it being a viable commercial entity, they had crunched the numbers and the development would work without an alcohol license.
5. Q. The 22:30pm closure time has now become 23:00pm for people to leave the site. This was not made clear at the beginning of the process and now verbally PL are saying 23:00pm. Can there not be a provision to cut that back?
 - A. It had always been a 22:30 cut off whereby people come off the pitches, change and leave, it had always been a 22:30pm cut off.
6. Further clarification by the Head of Development Control, that planning would be looking at a condition around the hours of use and timing of use. They would be talking to PL so that it's bought out clearly in the report for Planning Committee Members to consider.

6

OPEN SESSION - QUESTIONS AND VIEWS FROM THE FLOOR

NOTED the following questions and observations from attendees, grouped under subject headings:

1. Noise

Q. With reference to the sound map graph, PL had provided reasons regarding the highest existing noise at present and that the noise coming from the A10 was pre-dominantly traffic. This traffic going by was represented by the peaks on the graph line. However, it's not a constant noise, what residents were facing was 70DB at present. PL had said that they could reduce this by putting a 2m high barrier/partition. The noise from the playing pitches will be constant and always at that peak/level. Can you confirm that the 2m high barrier is a solid barrier and not a 1m kit board with the rest being mesh?

A. Yes, it is a kit board with another metre above that which is solid timber with no gap. It is a continuous 2m high barrier.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

Q. So therefore the noise level would still be at 60DB? To reduce it to 60DB, there will be a constant 60DB all the way below the recommendation of 54DB?

A. No, there were 2 elements to the noise:

- The red peaked line at the top of the graph are discreet individual peaks, that was not the continuous noise, this was a series of peaks from activity on the pitches from i.e. balls, whistles, etc. and other pitch activity.
- The blue line underneath that was more akin to the continuous level of noise, so that the road & train-line noise is there occasionally. So the level there is 49DB on that.

So, the blue dotted line is the continuous level of noise and the red line represents the discreet peaks of noise within that noise environment.

Q. At present, residents enjoy peace and quiet in their gardens. Once the facility has been developed, they will have no respite from noise being generated from users, regarding the facility operating all weekend from 09:00am till 22:30pm at night. There will be no peace at all and would be affecting their health and the way they live.

How can PL explain to the residents that the facility will not have an impact on them and that the noise will be controlled?

A. That's a decision for the Council to make, but the assessment is there. Sharp Redmour (noise consultants) assess the noise from a technical point of view, which is their job. It's modelled, assessed and compared to the guide line values. The subjective elements are within the assessment aswell.

Q. When the acoustic barriers are installed and the trees, the noise from the facility will still be above an unacceptable level?

A. No, that will not be the case. The acceptable levels are based upon the blue line (sound map noise graph). The guide line values of the blue line is 55DB and guideline values of the red line is 60DB. So the noise level will be at or below these guideline values. There isn't one for daytime values.

Q. The highest level on the sound map noise graph is 70DB and not 60DB as reported on the original sound plan noise graph.

A. That was the original sound plan noise graph without the acoustic barrier.

Q. in that original sound map noise graph, Sharp Redmour noise consultants (SR) labelled contours at 1.5m elevation. After the barrier is introduced the elevation is not mentioned and that's when it matters much more because the 2m acoustic barrier may reduce noise levels in residents' gardens. Residents children usually sleep in bedrooms' on the 1st & 2nd floors of properties which are 3m & 5m respectively, above the

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

ground. The 2m acoustic barrier would do nothing for that. If a sound map noise graph is produced for those elevations, it would still be showing 70DB and still be louder than anything but the trains passing. It would be a severe disturbance. This is something that would not harm those residential properties beyond the railway line, as is required by the Council for development in this community. It would cause harm and is not acceptable. The acoustic barrier would not work.

A. The assessment hired in the models is driven by standard assessment methodologies and for daytime activity it is 1.5m off the ground (elevation). That's the assessment.

Q. But the model does not assess other levels?

A. Other levels could be assessed but the measurement would be the same as in the original report, without barriers. Because if the acoustic barriers are taken out, we are back to the original report and then the levels, which is the assessment methodology for daytime or evening noise in this case is on the LEQ (the average sound level over the period of the measurement). The blue line would still be within the guideline levels on the original assessment. In SR view, the original assessment was within the guidelines and showed low impact as a result.

Q. But that came out at 1DB below the level the WHO (World Health Organisation) says would cause severe impact to peoples' health and well being.

A. No, it says it's the level below which there would be no effect. So you have to be careful how these guidelines are interpreted.

Resident View.

So there would be no effect on peoples' health and well-being and not something that residents' won't notice and would be something people could live with? If housebuilding caused that level of noise, you could say people could deal with. But it was not that there is no harm to the residents, when the new noise source is introduced at that level, the peaks and nature of that noise really ensures it is harmful. The mean level was not a problem, but the peaks and nature of that noise is what ensures that this facility will be harmful, to the enjoyment of residents' properties and the well-being of their children. This is not an acceptable development. No barrier would help, but what could help was a greater separation of the playing pitches and residents houses. If PL cannot produce a plan that allows that, which in a field of that size and that close to residents' properties, then the school site is not suitable for a development of this nature just on a matter of noise.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

- Q. When all the pitches are in use , there will be 80 people on the pitches. This would not be tolerable with the constant shouting and noise. There will be no respite and is not acceptable.
The school is located behind some resident's properties and the children can be heard from the playing field. Some residents didn't even know that the development was taking place. The development is not acceptable and is stressing out residents. Only a few residents had been notified on one side of the street and the residents themselves notified others.
- A. There had been an extensive consultation with residents living in roads around the site. Site notices had been put up as well. There was a limit to what planning would do and how far they would go. The Head of Development Management was comfortable with what they had done as regards consulting with residents.
- Q. Were noise measurements just taken from 22 Lathkill Close to compare traffic noise?
- A. Yes. All noise measurements were taken in the evening to establish the existing noise environment.
- Q. The garden sizes in Lathkill Close varied, so more house assessments should have been carried out?
- A. Noise models covered the whole area, including those properties in Lathkill Close.
- Q. What other facilities in other areas have been measured for noise?
- A. The Black Prince Trust, which is a charity community organisation. This was set up to provide, improve and maintain public amenities and recreational facilities in Lambeth. PL discussed the school site and indicated where the residencies were. Seven pitches had been developed there.
- Q. What would be the highest number of users on the playing pitches at any one time?
- A. The maximum number of people actually playing on the pitches would be 116.
- Q. What security measures are in place for the facility?
- A. This would be an operational issue on the ground. There will be a full time management team on-site. People using the facility will have to register their details with PL and then behave responsibly or they will not be able to use the facility. PL were responsible operators. Planning could also impose a site management plan which can then be monitored as a planning authority.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

- Q. The 2m high acoustic barrier, shown in the presentation, didn't look very attractive, How would it look at this facility? If the 116 users, that could be using the pitches at any one time, all left at the same time, what would happen?
- A. Users of the facility would have staggered arrival and leaving times. They would not all leave at the same time. There would be additional planting and landscaping to disguise the acoustic barrier. The barrier would follow the outline of the pitches but only on the A10 side of the site.
- Q. The blue area highlighted on the site plan, is described as football use. Not every child plays football, where will they go to play?
- A. The larger pitch has shorter grass and could be utilised for many other sports including hockey.
- Q. What materials would the acoustic boards be made of? They are usually made from Birch with a thin laminate that causes noise when something is kicked against it.
- A. This noise is within the assessment. There is cushioning within the board to keep noise levels down.
- Q. PL have 47 other sites that they manage, how many complaints about noise have there been and their outcomes?
- A. PL have only had 2 complaints; one from the Birmingham site and one from the Coventry site. The outcome of the Birmingham complaint was that residents complained about noise but there was no case to answer as it did not constitute a noise nuisance. The outcome of the Coventry complaint was that residents were concerned about noise, so PL put in acoustic measures i.e. a solid barrier.
- Q. Was there any measured data that could be presented, showing data before and after measurements are taken?
- A. PL could not answer this question, but would check if there was.

2. Licensing

- Q. Planning Committee will be scrutinising PL's business plan. Can PL please re-assure residents that the alcohol license will not be reinstated on the site, as a 20 year commitment?
- A. The voluntary removal of the license had been written in the 20 year lease. This was a board decision. The business model would work without the license but that the development would need other aspects to make the business work. The school would have a £2.5m sports facility privately funded.

Q. Will the Sports Hall be hired out for functions?

A. No, as there will not be a licensing facility. There may be children's parties and other daytime activities.

3. Parking

Q. At any one time there may be 116 people using the pitches and generating noise. With only 88 designated parking spaces on site, there will be a parking impact on surrounding roads?

A. Parking assessments had been taken for this, with surveys, as to what parking is expected on this site. The maximum accumulation would be 82 spaces used on site and there would be no need to consider increasing the parking spaces to 88 on site.

Q. As planning committee cannot impose a condition on the permission regarding the further application of an alcohol license, can a condition be imposed on the 20 year lease that PL have taken?

A. This could not be done through the planning process but will be reported to committee members. If a license was applied for it would be heard separately on its own merits. This would not impact on any planning application.

Q. The parking technical report was mis-leading . In the original proposal, PL had based their assessment of parking on data that was over 10 years old. PL had now come back with a minimal data set which included two sites surveyed on one weekday evening and at the weekend. On those two sites, which are Newham and Tottenham, PL had observed peak parking of 86 in Newham and 99 in Tottenham. Now, PL had suggested that the size of the Enfield site would be somewhere in between the 2 (86 – 99). They had predicted an equivalent number of players of 108 for the Enfield site and that the number of players, are based on the assumption that badminton players utilise 75% as much parking as football players. That assumption had no data behind it and had just been inserted in. However, this was only a slight increase. But if you take the peaks from the Newham/Tottenham data and project them to the sizes, you will get projected peaks from Newham, scaled to the size of the site for 90 and 95 for Tottenham. These were the observed peaks just scaled by the size of the site. PL had processed the data in a way where they look at averages for flocs and then ended up with an estimated peak of 82. This was substantially less than either of the 2 observed sites. This was not valid and was not acceptable as being a valid statistical processing of data. Therefore, for one evening of surveying, peaks were observed at 90-95 for this site and PL are claiming that 88 parking spaces are

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

adequate. This was not the case for one evening of surveying. This was not going through several months of data and trying to find what the worst case is, that there could be a robust estimate and be confident that this would never be exceeded. Another 10 spaces could be added but this would still not cover the estimated shortfall. There is a redemption of 90-95 and 98 parking spaces could be squeezed in and would probably be very awkward to use.

There was also another consideration that PL had missed within the technical report. The two areas that PL were comparing the development site to are Haringey & Newham. PL claim that the sites had similar levels of public transport access, but the significant difference between Enfield and Haringey/Tottenham was the level of car ownership. Outer London Borough's had greater car ownership, according to the 2011 Census. This was assessed with the following results:

- Haringey – 51.8% of households do not own a car.
- Newham – 52.1% of households do not own a car.
- Enfield – 32.5% of households do not own a car.

The number of households with 2,3, 4 cars was substantially greater in Enfield than it is in Newham. This data has been published.

The conclusion is that more people would travel by car to a site in Enfield than anywhere else, because more people in Enfield own cars. This was obvious but had been missed in the parking report because it didn't suit the case PL are trying to make. Parking will be inadequate, the extra 10 spaces would still not make it adequate. Residents will have a problem parking in the area.

- A. The purpose of the meeting tonight was to listen to people's views. Highways would talk to the applicant about the issues raised and make sure they are all addressed.

7

CLOSE OF MEETING

NOTED the closing points, including:

1. The Chair thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting. He felt it had been constructive and respectful and would be of great assistance in evaluating the application.
2. Notes taken at this meeting would be appended to the Planning Officers' report to be considered by the Planning Committee when the application was presented for decision. It was intended to present this application to Planning Committee by May/June 2015.

PLANNING PANEL - 9.4.2015

3. There was a deputation procedure whereby involved parties could request to address the Planning Committee meeting (details on the Council website or via the Planning Committee Secretary 020 8379 4093 / 4091 jane.creer@enfield.gov.uk or metin.halil@enfield.gov.uk and residents could also ask ward councillors to speak on their behalf.
4. Full details of the application were available to view and download from the Council's website www.enfield.gov.uk (Application Ref: 14/04965/FUL).
5. The consultation period had been extended as advised and would now end on Friday 24 April 2015.
6. The Panel suggested that a site visit would be useful, including another facility in London, so as to compare sites. This would have to be agreed by the Chair of Planning Committee.