



ENABLING PROJECTS
TOWN PLANNERS

**LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY,
COMMUNITY GROUP AND
PLANNING OBJECTIONS WORK
2003-2020**

www.enablinguk.com

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
<i>HARMAN DRIVE</i>	<i>LARGE REAR EXTENSION</i>	<i>BARNET</i>	<i>CHANGED SCHEME, 2020</i>	<i>We argued that, whilst a scheme is possible, that it should be made smaller in some respects.</i>
<i>STANHOPE GARDENS</i>	<i>LARGE REAR EXTENSION</i>	<i>HARINGEY</i>	<i>CHANGED SCHEME, 2020</i>	<i>Successful representations to achieve a smaller scheme.</i>
<i>RICHMOND AVENUE</i>	<i>LARGE REAR EXTENSION</i>	<i>MERTON</i>	<i>CHANGED SCHEME, 2020</i>	<i>Small scheme resulted from our comments.</i>
<i>KYNASTON ROAD, CROYDON</i>	<i>SIDE & REAR EXTENSION</i>	<i>CROYDON</i>	<i>CHANGED SCHEME, 2019</i>	<i>The scheme was made smaller in the light of our comments.</i>
<i>WEST EALING STATION</i>	<i>25 STOREY TOWER BLOCK</i>	<i>EALING</i>	<i>REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION</i>	<i>We advised on the planning policy aspects of the tall buildings. Complex planning issues involved.</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
RIBBLESDALE AVENUE	LARGE HOUSE EXTENSION	BARNET	REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION	<i>Refused in December 2018, after we did a comprehensive objection on the amenity problems created by this scheme. The client's garden was protected.</i>
CRESCENT WAY	LARGE HOUSE EXTENSION	BARNET	REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION	<i>Refused TWICE in 2018, after we did a objection on the various problems created by this scheme.</i>
FERME PARK ROAD	REAR EXTENSION	HARINGEY	REFUSAL	<i>Objection to large rear extension.</i>
BROWN'S ROAD	ADJ. SIDE EXTENSION	WALTHAM FOREST	REFUSAL	<i>Objection to large side extension. 2019.</i>
MASWELL PARK ROAD	REAR EXTENSION	HOUNSLOW COUNCIL	REFUSAL	<i>Objection to large rear extension. 2019</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
STERNHALL LANE	REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE WITH MIXED USE SCHEME	SOUTHWARK	SCHEME REFUSED	<i>In-depth objection to a scheme which is overdevelopment. Lengthy objection letter lodged in Dec 16. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
MILESPIT HILL SITE	PROPOSED CEMETERY	BARNET	SCHEME GOING TO INQUIRY AFTER REFUSAL BY COUNCIL	<i>We objected for a neighbour against this large cemetery, which is on Green Belt Land. A refusal occurred and the objection is ongoing. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
SISPARA GARDENS	LARGE REAR EXTENSION	WANDSWORTH	SCHEME AMENDED AS A RESPONSE TO OBJECTION, 2016	<i>Successful objection to large rear extension on two applications. Officers took on board our scheme suggestions to make the scheme acceptable. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
WHITECHAPEL REGENERATION SITE	WHITECHAPEL REGENERATION	TOWER HAMLETS	SCHEME REFUSED, 2016	<i>Scheme objection to very big regeneration scheme. Objection aimed at reducing elements of proposal, which was successful. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
WINDSOR ROAD	REAR EXTENSION	BARNET	APPROVAL WITH AMENDMENTS 2016	<i>Letter of objection to imposing rear extension. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
ELM AVENUE, N10	GARAGE REDEVELOPMENT	HARINGEY	SCHEME REFUSED, 2016	<i>We acted for clients who lived opposite the garage site. Our objection letter helped get the scheme refused. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
HODFORD ROAD 2	SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS	BARNET COUNCIL	CHANGED SCHEME 2015	<i>Letter of objection against scale of extensions</i>
HOOP LANE, NW11	BLOCK OF FLATS	BARNET COUNCIL	CHANGED SCHEME, 2013	<i>Letter of objection to an overbearing block of flats, which was changed after our comments. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
WOODSTOCK AVENUE, NW11	ROOF EXTENSION	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL REFUSAL 2014	<i>Letter of objection for neighbour for large roof extension. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
HODFORD ROAD, GOLDERS GREEN	RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL REFUSAL ACHIEVED 2010 & 2011	<i>We acted for a neighbour on multiple applications in objecting to a large rear extension. Our representations were successful, with the refusal notice referring to issues that we raised. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
GRANGE AVENUE, LONDON N20	RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL REFUSAL ACHIEVED 2010	<i>We objected for a neighbour on two applications for a large rear extension. Our representations were successful. (NEIGHBOUR CLIENT).</i>
HELENSLEA AVENUE, NW11	RESIDENTIAL EXTENSION	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL OBJECTION 2014	<i>This case was an enforcement objection to an overlarge extension. Many letters were written including involvement in an enforcement appeal.</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
DOLLIS HILL ESTATE, BROOK ROAD, DOLLIS HILL	ERECTION OF 176 DWELLINGS IN TWO LARGE BLOCKS PLUS NEW SCHOOL	BRENT COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL APPEAL DECISION – PUBLIC INQUIRY HELD IN ABEYANCE IN APRIL 2005 AND PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED FOR ADJACENT SCHOOL EXTENSION	<i>Working for Brent Council, we helped wholly change the direction of a scheme that proposed the complete loss of a large industrial estate and many local businesses, to be replaced by a highly intensive residential scheme with smaller new school. Our approach was twofold. First, we recommended to the Council to provide a Statement of Case (the first document of appeal grounds to be lodged by the Council in a public inquiry case) that contained more detail than normal, thus conveying to the Appellant the strength of the Council’s case. That case contained much information on local business and educational needs, as well as an exhaustive assessment of the demerits of the proposed buildings. Second, we recommended that the adjacent school, which was desperately in need of more land to build new school buildings and accommodate local educational needs, submit a planning application for a school extension plus some new business space. This approach was complex and its success resulted in major community benefits. The appeal has since been held in abeyance and the outline consent for the John Kelly Schools extension granted. We left the project with a totally changed situation, from negative to positive. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>
KINGS COLLEGE SCHOOL, WIMBLEDON	ERECTION OF LARGE HOUSE & ANCILLARY USES ON PLAYING FIELD LAND	MERTON COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL REFUSAL ACHIEVED FEBRUARY 2007, DEALT WITH RE-APP 2009	<i>The proposal involved the building of headmaster’s accommodation in the form of a large house on open playing field land. We focused and clarified the resident’s objection and provided a wide ranging letter of objection, covering such issues as developing on non-previously developed land, open space issues, sustainable community issues, outlook and loss of visual amenity. Having seen our letter of objection the School decided to withdraw the application, which was a very satisfying result for our clients. (RESIDENTS GROUP CLIENT).</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
575 NORTH END ROAD, WEMBLEY, HA9	ERECTION OF 325 BEDROOM, 17 STOREY HOTEL WITH FUNCTION & ASSOCIATED FACILITIES	BRENT COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL APPEAL DECISION – SCHEME WITHDRAWN. APRIL 2005	<i>We were brought in at appeal stage by Brent Council on this project, the Appellant relying on the fact of the site's location within the Wembley Regeneration Area should justify a highly intensive hotel scheme. In fact, the scheme had a large adverse townscape and amenity impact. Our Statement of Case for the public inquiry set out in detail the shortcomings of the proposal, which including a severe amenity impact and worsened townscape. The scheme was withdrawn after our Statement was lodged, with a revised scheme being submitted at a later time. This is case is typical of how our work for Brent has resulted in improved schemes. Our work 'on both sides of the fence' has been highly supportive on our wider project quality. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>
RUSSEL GROVE, MILL HILL, LONDON NW7	SCHEMES FOR THE ERECTION OF 9 FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – THE APPEAL WAS REFUSED. APRIL 2005.	<i>Working for a residents association in the Mill Hill, area (north London), we supported objections to an appeal for the erection of 9 flats. Giving expert evidence at inquiry and cross examining the developer, we assisted winning the case on loss of outlook, worsened character and inappropriate bulk and mass grounds. This was an importantly won case for the local community as this 'modest sized' scheme could have led to a flood of similar proposals in the area. (RESIDENT ASSOCIATION CLIENT).</i>
17 MAPESBURY ROAD, KILBURN	ERECTION OF HOUSE IN REAR GARDEN	BRENT COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL APPEAL DECISION – APPEAL DISMISSED 10 th JANUARY 2005	<i>The scheme involved a large rear garden in the Mapesbury Conservation Area, within which a large house was proposed. We presented a case stating that a harmful effect on the CA would be caused by the loss of the garden and a visually important group of trees, plus an adverse affect on townscape, amenity and parking. The Inspector agreed with our points and dismissed the appeal. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
715 NORTH CIRCULAR ROAD LONDON, NW2	THE ERECTION OF WAREHOUSE & SHOWROOM/ OFFICES FOR STONE MATERIALS BUSINESS	BRENT COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – APPEAL DISMISSED ON 16th SEPTEMBER 2004	<i>Acting for Brent Council on a planning appeal, we presented a case to the Inspector that the proposed buildings, which would have created a significant commercial building, would have increased the intensity of use to such an extent that traffic conditions on the North Circular Road would be worsened. The Inspector accepted our argument that there could be a considerable increase in office and sales staff plus customers, this resulting in potential traffic safety problems on the NCR. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>
POINT WHARF, FERRY QUAYS, BRENTFORD	CONSTRUCTION OF LARGE A3/A1 BUILDING CLOSE TO NEW APARTMENTS	HOUNSLOW COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – THE OBJECTION WAS SUPPORTED BY THE PLANNERS. WORK COMPLETED FEBRUARY 2004	<i>We acted for a Residents Association who objected to a scheme lodged by the developers for luxury apartments on the Thames in Brentford (west London). The proposal involved the construction of a large restaurant and retail building close to the newly developed dwellings. Severe amenity problems would have been caused if it had been permitted. We formulated a detailed objection and gave technical planning advice on the matter. We were entirely successful, with the A3/A1 element of the scheme being withdrawn as a result of our representations. (RESIDENT ASSOCIATION CLIENT).</i>
LARGE MIXED USE SCHEME AT 96-122 UXBRIDGE ROAD, WEST EALING	CONSTRUCTION BUILDINGS CONTAINING 140 FLATS AND DEPARTMENT STORE WITH THREE LEVELS OF PARKING	EALING COUNCIL	PERMISSION GRANTED IN MAY 2004 WITH NEGOTIATED CHANGES AND CONDITIONS IN FAVOUR OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY	<i>Local residents in West Ealing were shocked when a massive mixed use scheme was lodged for planning close to their homes. Being a minimum 35m away from the nearest houses and with multiple levels of parking and up to 8 stories of residential flats, the scheme, if permitted, was likely to cause a great amenity impact, including loss of light and worsened outlook. Within one week of receiving instructions we prepared a 30 page Statement outlining the objection to the scheme and promoting improved community consultations on the proposal. Our work secured significant changes to the bulk and layout of the scheme plus conditions in favour of the RESIDENT ASSOCIATION CLIENT).</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
RUSSEL GROVE, MILL HILL, LONDON NW7	TWO SCHEMES FOR THE ERECTION OF 14 FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING	BARNET COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – THE APPEALS WERE REFUSED BY THE INSPECTOR ON GROUNDS PUT FORWARD IN OUR CASE. JANUARY 2004.	<i>Working for a residents association in the Mill Hill, area (north London), we supported objections to two appeals for the erection of 14 flats. We formulated an Appeal Statement that analysed overdevelopment, amenity impact, traffic, parking and other issues. This was followed by an appearance at an informal hearing. The objection at appeal was successful, with the Inspector placing weight on our comments on character an appearance, openness and accessibility issues. (RESIDENT ASSOCIATION CLIENT).</i>
LAND AT RAILSHEAD ROAD, ISLEWORTH	DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 18 DWELLINGS	RICHMOND-UPON-THAMES COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – AS A RESULT OF OUR REPRESENTATIONS, THE APPEAL WAS WITHDRAWN (JUNE 2004)	<i>Working for Richmond-upon Thames Council, we assembled an inquiry statement against a scheme for the redevelopment of a small business park with 18 dwellings. There were many design inconsistencies with the scheme, which we emphasised. The case was complex and we assessed issues such as housing provision, employment need, conservation and design issues, flood risk matters, riverside issues and educational contributions. After seeing our case, the Appellant withdrew the appeal. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>
TROWLOCK AVENUE, TEDDINGTON	DEMOLITION OF BUILDING AND ERECTION OF BUILDING CONTAINING 8 FLATS	RICHMOND-UPON-THAMES COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – APPEAL DISMISSED JUNE 2004.	<i>The appeal dealt with the demolition of a bungalow and its replacement with a relatively large building containing 8 flats. We argued for the Council that, although the rear and front building lines related to the adjacent property, the proposed building, in its highly prominent position, adversely impacted on local character. The Council's case was upheld and the appeal dismissed. Over a period of 18 months we undertook many appeals for Richmond Council, successfully working on many complex cases, including a series of difficult committee reversals of the officer's recommendation. (LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY CLIENT).</i>

SITE ADDRESS	SCHEME	LOCAL AUTHORITY	DECISION	COMMENTARY
SITE IN OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE	ERECTION OF LARGE SIDE & REAR EXTENSION TO HOUSE	HARROW COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – SCHEME WITHDRAWN WITHIN ONE WEEK OF OUR SUBMISSION. WORK COMPLETED SEPTEMBER 2003	<i>The proposed scheme involved a large side and rear extension to the adjacent house of our client, which would have closed off the large gap between the houses. Objections had been lodged but we added to this in the form of a long letter of objection, referring to policy and design standards. The objection was completely successful, with the scheme being withdrawn within one week of lodging our representations. (INDIVIDUAL CLIENT).</i>
SITE IN WOODSTOCK MEWS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON	DEVELOPMENT OF MEWS BUILDING & USE AS OFFICES ADJOINING HOSPITAL	WESTMINSTER COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL DECISION – SCHEME WITHDRAWN SOON AFTER WE LODGED OUR STATEMENT. WORK COMPLETED OCTOBER 2003	<i>The redevelopment scheme was lodged by an NHS Trust that owned a large hospital adjacent to our client's mews building site. We prepared an in-depth Statement of Objection that included reference to the technicalities of planning units and ancillary uses, plus issues of linking the building to an adjoining site and intensification. The complex argument was acknowledged by the Council and, after a meeting between the case officer and NHS Trust representatives, the scheme was withdrawn. This was a very successful outcome since a grant of planning permission would have significantly worsened amenity in the street. (INDIVIDUAL CLIENT).</i>
R/O ALYN COURT, CRESCENT ROAD, CROUCH END	ERECTION OF FOUR HOUSES	HARINGEY COUNCIL	SUCCESSFUL REFUSAL ACHIEVED FEBRUARY 2009	<i>We acted for a group of 5 households, being residents in an adjacent block to the development site. The scheme involved replacing a line of lock up garages with four houses and losing trees and some open land for gardens. We assembled a comprehensive objection referring to garage loss, access, and tree loss. The application was refused in February 2007. (RESIDENTS GROUP CLIENT).</i>

CONTACT DETAILS

Enabling Projects Limited

 020 8381 4311  interface@enablinguk.com

 www.enablinguk.com

*Office address available on request by e-mail
We are based in London UK*

OUR MAIN WORKING AREAS IS THE GREATER LONDON AREA: