

Public Document Pack

CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP - 30.7.2019

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP HELD ON TUESDAY, 30 JULY 2019

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Anne Brown and Ayfer Orhan

ABSENT Guner Aydin, Ergin Erbil and Lindsay Rawlings

CO-OPTED D Stacey (Bush Hill Park Conservation Area Study Group), A. Bishop-Laggett, A. Newman (Clay Hill Study Group), C. Horner (Southgate Green Study Group), P. Hutchinson (Grange Park Conservation Area Study Group), J Dougharty (Southgate District Civic Trust), J West (The Enfield Society), N Paddon-Smith (Meadway Conservation Area Study Group), W Brown (Enfield Town Conservation Area Study Group), A Day (Lake's Estate Conservation Area Study Group), T Adnan (Trent Park Conservation Committee), R Wilson (Hadley Wood Conservation Area Study Group) and D Gandhi (Federation of Enfield Residents and Allied Associations)

OFFICERS: Bridget Pereira (Conservation Officer), Andy Higham (Head of Development Management) and Christine White (Heritage Officer) Penelope Williams (Secretary)

Also Attending: Haydn Jones (Saville Jones Consultants)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Aydin, Ergin Erbil and Rawlings and from P Fisk (Forty Hill and Bulls Cross Study Group) and J Barnett (Trent Park Conservation Committee).

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES

Th minutes of the meeting held on 2 July 2019 were received and agreed as a correct record with the following amendments:

Item 5.1 Southgate Office Village

- To remove the words “parking was not an issue” (Noted 2)

CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP - 30.7.2019

- To delete Noted 15 and replace with “Historic England’s full assessment of the application was awaited amid concerns about the tallest building”.
- To include mention that the Conservation Advisory Committee had not received the outcome of a meeting that had taken place between the Council’s Design Review Panel and the developer.
- To change Noted 20 to CAG would expect, should planning permission be granted, that all large developments such as the proposed would make a wider contribution to the community, using the S106 procedure.

4

HERITAGE BRIEFING

The Conservation Advisory Group received a heritage briefing note prepared by Christine White (Heritage and Urban Design Manager) which had been circulated earlier.

NOTED

1. The information provided in the briefing note.
2. The additional information provided on the feasibility work being undertaken on Broomfield House including information on the covenant, stable block and stable yard.
3. A review of the Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 was being carried out to provide a more evidential base for use of the monies received.

5

TO RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE PROPOSALS FOR EDMONTON METHODIST CHURCH

Haydn Jones of Saville Jones Consultants presented proposals for the Edmonton Methodist Church.

This application preserved the arts and crafts façade of the church fronting Fore Street, creating a new community church facility, together with a four-storey residential development, including 24 apartments.

CAG had no objection to the proposals and were pleased that a landmark building, defined in the character appraisal of the area, would be preserved.

Members were also supportive of the sustainability elements but did express some concern about the lack of affordable housing.

AGREED that CAG had no objection to the proposals.

6

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND LISTED BUILDING APPLICATIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Former Middlesex University Trent Park Campus, Trent Park Country Park, Snakes Lane, Enfield, EN4 0PS (REF: 19/02205/NMA)

This application concerns non-material amendments to house types, given previous approval under the redevelopment scheme.

1.1 Reconfiguration of Flat over Garage House Type

CAG objected to this change which they saw as material as the proposals reduced the quality and appearance of the original property. Concern was also expressed at the proposed brickwork: it appeared layered and was unacceptable.

1.2 Reconfiguration of House Type 6

CAG objected to this change which they thought was material. While being supportive of the proposals for the reconfiguration of the roof, they objected to the loss of the individual bays, the relocation of the chimney, the removal of the characterful side bay and the changes to fenestration. Concern was also expressed at the proposed brickwork: it appeared layered and was unacceptable. They agreed overall that the proposals would destroy the clarity and simplicity of the original scheme.

1.3 Amendments to House Type 7

CAG objected to these amendments which they thought were material changes. They objected to the removal of the chimney, the change to the canopy on the entrance porch, the removal of the modern style balcony and of the high side window. Concern was also expressed at the proposed brickwork: it appeared layered and was unacceptable. They agreed that the changes moved away from the simplicity of the consented scheme.

1.4 Amendments to House Type 10

CAG objected to these amendments which they agreed were material changes. They objected to the significant alterations to the design, moving away from the simplicity of the consented scheme, including the change of porch style, the string course, the specification of the roof materials and the layered brick patterning.

1.5 Amendments to House Type 15

CAG objected to these amendments which they agreed were material changes. They objected to the alterations which took away from the simplicity of the consented scheme: including the complicated fenestration, changes to the window head detail and to the quoins. The majority were however content with the introduction of a third dormer

CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP - 30.7.2019

window on the front roof. It was unclear whether the face brickwork has changed from the consented scheme.

CAG was also concerned, in general, about the proposed fenestration changes to most house types. Further framing has been added; the net result being to negate the original design simplicity.

CAG agreed that the sum of the changes were material as they significantly altered the architectural style of the whole scheme. Overall the proposals were unacceptable and lowered the quality of the consented designs.

2. Clarendon Cottage, 17 Gentlemen's Row, Enfield, EN2 6PT (REF: 19/02293/FUL)

The application proposed significant alterations to this grade 2* listed 16th century building with 17th and 18th century extensions.

CAG objected to the application because of the lack of clarity in relation to NPPF (Paragraph 189) policy. It was difficult to determine what was proposed from the plans.

It was suggested that the Charles Lamb Society also be contacted for comment.

3. 31-33 Church Street, Enfield, EN2 6AJ (REF: 19/02117/FUL)

This was a retrospective application for the refurbishment of the existing shop front and changes to the signage on the building, opposite the post office, a locally listed building.

CAG had no objection, subject to confirmation that the proposed illuminated signage was no more than had been approved recently for the new Metro Bank on the Market Square.

4. Commercial Premises, 105 Chase Side, Enfield, EN2 6NL (REF 19/02447/FUL) (Chase Medical)

At its meeting in March CAG had received a presentation on this application which had been subject to extensive CAG consultation over the past 3 years. Key changes since March included the part green roof, the addition of solar panels and air conditioning units on the front lower roof.

CAG had no objection to the application subject to the following conditions:

- The lift motor overrun to the agreed 791mm above roof level as defined on an earlier drawing 1211-413 dated 21/11/18 titled 13 person stretcher lift.
- Cladding to the overrun to be light grey in colour.
- The three brick types (red multi, creamy white and blue engineering) to be specifically conditioned by the manufacturer and type following the

CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP - 30.7.2019

onsite review, 24/5/19 of the sample panels and CAG's earlier approval 8/4/19.

- The mortar type to be specified to the manufacturer and type. The same mortar to be used for the three brick types.
- The external brickwork to be finished in Flemish bond.
- Joints to be restricted to eight laid bricks per 600mm of brickwork.
- That the building should have shallow bucket handle mortar joints.
- The provision of an agreed sample control panel.
- That the air conditionings units be placed in a less visible position.

7

CHAIR'S FEEDBACK FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE

There was no feedback about items considered at recent Planning Committee meetings.

8

CONSERVATION OFFICER'S UPDATES AT CASES DISCUSSED AT PREVIOUS CAG MEETINGS

Received and noted the Conservation Officer's update on items discussed at recent Conservation Advisory Group meetings.

9

CONSERVATION AREAS, LISTED BUILDING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS DETERMINED

Received and noted the list of conservation area and listed building applications determined from 24 June 2019 to 21 July 2019.

10

OPEN SESSION

1. Trees along the Railway Embankments

Hadley Wood Conservation Area Study Group advised that the policy which had resulted in the removal of many trees and vegetation along the borough's railway lines has been changed. Trees are now being treated as an asset and only those trees which it was necessary for operational reasons to remove were being felled. Trial re-planting is taking place in some areas.

2. **Hertford Loop** - Hadley Wood Conservation Area Study Group advised that dialogue with the community was taking place.

3. Boundary Commission Review – Changes to the Ward Boundaries

The Boundary Commission is currently undertaking a review into the borough's ward boundaries. This could have an impact on conservation bodies. They were recommended to feed in to the current boundary commission consultation.

CONSERVATION ADVISORY GROUP - 30.7.2019

4. **23 Camlet Way** – Planning permission had been granted for this site with a strong landscaping condition. Work seemed to be taking place ignoring the condition. Enforcement action was needed. Andy Higham agreed to look into it.
5. **Maze Inn, Southgate Conservation Area** - this had recently been demolished without planning permission. Enforcement action was being undertaken.
6. **Haydon House Office Block** – large antennae had been installed. Andy Higham agreed to check whether they had planning permission.
7. **107 Derwent Road** – Lakes Estate Conservation Area Study Group to initiate enforcement procedures.
8. **6 Old Park Road** – Lakes Estate Conservation Area Study Group to pursue progress of the appeal through the Inspectorate's web site.
9. **Beaver Town Development, East Duck Lees Lane** – The Enfield Society to check whether the core of the building was being retained as agreed.

11

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS

NOTED the calendar of meetings for the rest of the year and the date agreed for the next meeting:

- Tuesday 3 September 2019