

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

Councillors Peacock (Chair), Bevan (Deputy Chair), Hare, Dodds, Demirci, Patel, Weber and Adje

Also Present: Councillor

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PASC29.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Beacham.</p>	
PASC30.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>In accordance with standing order 32 (6) no business other than that listed shall be transacted at the meeting.</p>	
PASC31.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Cllr Peacock declared a personal interest in the decision to be taken under agenda item 12, points 1 and 2. "I believe that the application for planning permission significantly affects the interests of the same organisation that has made a donation to a charity that I have been involved in, in my capacity as secretary of the Tottenham Carnival. This donation has not benefited me financially in any way but I thought it proper to bring them to the attention of this committee. Although I am confident that I would be able to come to a decision on the question solely on the basis of the planning arguments this could also be considered a prejudicial interest. I have decided in the interests of maintaining the highest standards of probity on these issues, to absent myself from the meeting when this item is considered".</p> <p>Cllr Bevan declared an interest in agenda item 12, points 1 and 2. "I am the joint Treasurer of a local voluntary group; a known contributor to this group is involved in this application. My position is that I genuinely believe that I only have a "personal interest" and have been advised as such. However, as this is a particularly controversial application, this being the third time it has been before the full planning committee, I will not take any part in this application. This as a matter of caution and to avoid any possible controversy concerning public perception on this occasion".</p> <p>Cllr Winskill declared a personal interest in agenda item 12, points 1 and 2 in that his partner's family live in the flats which over look the site.</p> <p>Cllr Peacock proposed that in the absence of herself and the deputy chair that Cllr Dodds should chair the meeting for this item. The meeting agreed.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

PASC32.	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</p> <p>None received.</p>	
PASC33.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Members were asked to note that under PASC 25, item 4 (40 Coleridge Road N8) it had been agreed that the Highways improvement contribution would include works to the car park if deemed necessary.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub Committee held on 26 June 2006 be agreed and signed subject to the above amendment.</p>	
PASC34.	<p>APPEAL DECISIONS</p> <p>Members were asked to note that there had been a number of appeal decisions taken over the last few weeks. The report detailed two appeals on telecoms. These were unpopular with the public however, one was upheld and the other dismissed.</p> <p>On page 24 of the report there had been a lengthy public enquiry on the London Concrete Planning appeal. This was eventually allowed however, the inspectors had attached numerous conditions which the operator was required to adhere to.</p> <p>Page 26. The Odeon Cinema public enquiry the inspectors had agreed with the Council that it was an inappropriate development and therefore the appeal was dismissed.</p> <p>Members raised concern over the number of appeals (46%) which had been allowed. Officers advised that they were attempting to achieve a better percentage, however, June's figures may have been affected by the introduction of the new UDP.</p> <p>Cllr Dodds requested a copy of the appeal decision for 725 -733 Lordship Lane as there had been a significant loss of Section 106 money. The Legal Officer confirmed that this had been obtained in full.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Officers provide Cllr Dodds with a copy of the appeal decision for 725-733 Lordship Lane. 2. That Members note the report. 	
PASC35.	<p>DELEGATED DECISIONS</p> <p>Members were asked to note the decisions taken under delegated powers between 12 June 2006 and 9 July 2006.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

PASC36.	PERFORMANCE STATISTICS Members were asked to note the decisions taken within set time targets by Development Control and Planning Enforcement work since the Planning Application Sub Committee held on 26 June 2006.	
PASC37.	PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REVIEW FOR 2005 The Assistant Director, Enforcement Services presented the report by advising the Committee that Enforcement Services started at the end of 2003 and that he had taken over Planning Enforcement in early 2004. The report detailed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A breakdown of the activity on a number of cases since 2002.• Details of the closures activities.• Analysis of the types of enforcement work carried out.• Analysis of the work on enforcement appeals.• Achievements on work on HMO's, Tower Gardens and Conservation issues; wardens and estate activities, fly posting, public eyesores programme which operates through the better Haringey programme.• Work around Licensing and the 2003 Licensing Act.• General Improvements in the levels of work. In point 5.1 of the report Members were advised there had been a 72% increase in case closures and 1432 had been resolved. 10% of the cases went back as far as 2001. Therefore the Committee was asked to draw a line and close old cases registered before the end of December 2003. The majority of complaints received were about house conversions (20%), followed by development extensions (15%) and departure from approved plans. The report sets out considerable effort in resolving outstanding cases, to move forward with agreement to close old cases and to be able to then concentrate on priorities for seeking remedial actions. Members raised the following concerns: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That complainants should be informed when a case is closed.2. That when enforcement action is commenced it should continue until resolved.3. That a further report be provided detailing the complaints to be closed by ward. RESOLVED That the decision to agree the recommendations be deferred pending receipt of a further detailed report on the complaints to be closed by ward.	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

PASC38.	72 - 74 TWYFORD AVENUE N2 Officers presented the report and confirmed that one issue not decided by the Committee on 26 June 2006 was the education provision. The applicants were not prepared to agree to the higher figure toward the education contribution. Recent appeal decisions indicated that the applicant's decision may be correct. The design and layout of the application was considered to be an improvement on the previous scheme. It was recommended that the Committee accept the £100k towards the Educational contribution. RESOLVED That Members agreed the recommendations outlined in the report.	
PASC39.	27 - 31 AVENUE ROAD N15 Members were advised this application was determined in 2004 and should have a legal Section 106 agreement. Page 84, paragraph 3, concludes that it is not appropriate for the Council to seek a legal agreement. The Committee is therefore requested to agree two further conditions instead and grant the application subject to the above change. RESOLVED That Members agreed to the recommendation outlined in the report.	
PASC40.	PLANNING APPLICATIONS Cllr Peacock and Cllr Bevan left the meeting at this point and Cllr Dodds took the Chair. RESOLVED That the decisions of the Sub Committee on the planning applications and related matters, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes, be approved or refused, with the following points noted: 1. Cecile News, Rear of 60 – 88 Cecile Park N8 Officers presented the report by advising the Committee that this item had four appeals still be to decided. The report identified the main concerns raised. Officers informed the Committee that a site visit had now taken place the previous Friday. There had been a number of additional items presented since the report had been written. Lynn Featherstone MP had confirmed her objections to the proposals and there had also been an additional letter from the Tree Trust for Haringey. Nine additional letters had been received from residents raising similar objections to those in	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

the report.

Objectors spoke on behalf of the Gladwell-Landrock-Cecile Park Residents Action Group (GLCRAG) and presented nine reasons why the application should not be granted:

- The buildings will be unacceptably intrusive.
- Risk to the appearance, health and development of the TPO oak tree.
- Unacceptable loss of the lock-up garages.
- The development does not meet the design standard required to prevent overlooking and lack of privacy.
- Poor quality of the site planning.
- The narrow access creates a substandard environment.
- Dereliction of the site by the applicants.
- Over development of a constricted, elongated Conservation Area.
- Not a reasonable use of planning conditions as an alternative to refusal.

The Chair granted Cllr Winskill the opportunity to address the Committee. Cllr Winskill spoke of his concerns over developing this back land site which would not enhance the conservation area. The existing lock up garages offer relief to the streets surrounding this site which experience problems of parking pressure.

The applicant's representative spoke and informed the Committee that the issues regarding the trees, highway and density had all been dealt with, approved and resolved in the report at page 128. The applicant's representative further stated that they had looked at the development over a period of 4 – 5 years and this was the right application. That Paul Simon accept that if the application was granted the previous two would be dismissed as every single aspect had been considered.

Members discussed access to the site for emergency vehicles, waste collection and the impact on visual intrusion of the development.

The Chair then moved to vote on the acceptance of the Officers recommendations. Members voted 3 for (Cllrs Dodds, Patel and Adje) and 3 against (Cllrs Hare, Demirci and Weber). In accordance with standing order 42 point 3, the Chair had the casting vote for. The motion was carried.

RESOLVED

That the application was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

In accordance with standing order 42 point 2, Cllrs Demirci, Hare and Weber requested their descent be recorded.

2. Cecile Mews, Rear of 60 – 88 Cecile Park N8 (Conservation Area

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

Consent)

Members were asked to consider Conversation Area Content for the above demolition. The Committee agreed to grant conservation area consent subject to conditions. Cllrs Demirci, Hare and Weber abstained from the decision.

Cllr Peacock and Cllr Bevan re-entered the proceedings and Cllr Dodds relinquished and Cllr Peacock took the Chair.

3. Land at Winns Mews (Off Grove Park Road) N15

Members were advised that the application had come to Committee previously and been refused. The proposed site was between residential and commercial properties on Grove, Park and Beaconsfield Roads and was within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area and the site is currently vacant.

Officer informed members that the proposal was within the density range and had no adverse effects on the amenity of the existing properties. The scheme is car park free, with provision for refuse and bicycle stores.

Members received and noted a tabled document from the Clyde Area Residents' Association detailing their comments on this application:

- Size of the development
- Biodiversity
- Sustainability
- Sustainable materials
- Consideration for Neighbours during building work

Members decided to agree to grant the application subject to conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement.

4. Land at Winns Mews (Off Grove Park Road) N15 (Conservation Area Consent)

Members were asked to consider Conversation Area Content for the above demolition. Members agreed to grant conservation area consent.

5. Unit 21, Cranford Way N8

Officers described this application as the headquarters for a firm who would cater for high class joinery. The proposal should create employment for 40 people and would have no significant impact on surrounding properties.

It was proposed that the workshop would open from 7am – 5pm, the office from 8am – 6pm and the buildings from 8am – 1pm on Saturday.

A noise assessment had been carried out and there would be no audible noise to the nearest residential property. The site does have need for

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

public transport accessibility and therefore travel plans would be entered into.

The applicant is considering installing a fuel burner to burn off cuts of wood to provide a sustainable source of on-site energy.

Members questioned the use of the fuel burner, the collection of waste from the premises and the clarification of the Restaurant/Bar. The applicants informed the Committee that the fuel burner would be a sustainable process to generate heat. Waste would be collected every two weeks by Haringey. The restaurant/bar is a canteen for people working at the premises.

The applicant consented to the following conditions being imposed:

1. That the restaurant/bar should not remain open past the normal hours of operation.
2. That the building designs incorporate a green roof to make the visual impact less obtrusive.
3. That the area surrounding the building is planted and landscaped.

Members decided to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Chair decided to vary the order of the applications and take application 7 next. Cllr Canver entered the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

7. Unit 2, 4 & 5 103 – 149 Cornwall Road & Land Adjoining 2 Falmer Road N15

Officers presented the report and advised that the proposal consisted of a 3 storey building and not a 4 bedroom house. The site is in a predominantly residential area. The scheme provides for 48% of the units being affordable and the overall bulk and height is acceptable.

Members requested clarity on the number of units to be provided and a breakdown of the number which would constitute social housing. Members asked whether a lift was to be installed and was informed by officers that the life mentioned on page 216 would not be included and also the 4 bedroom house on page 220 had now been removed.

Two objectors spoke representing local residents and outlined their objections to the proposals:

1. There was confusion over the plans and the report was inaccurate.
2. The transportation group refer to offices and there are none.
3. The photographs attached to the report show only the northern part of the site.
4. Previous objections were not mentioned in the report.
5. The density figure is well above the maximum level.
6. The new buildings are 3.5 metres higher than the existing buildings.
7. The building would diminish the sky line in Chestnuts Park.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

	<p>The Chair granted Cllr Canver the opportunity to address the Committee. Cllr Canver informed the Committee that the access to the park was not satisfactory. There were safety concerns as there would be a high wall. Cllr Canver encouraged Members to see the site and requested that the application be rejected in order to give an opportunity to renegotiate the proposal.</p> <p>The applicant's representative addressed the Committee and stated that since the Development Control Forum a storey had been taken off the development. That the density was within that stated in the London Plan. The site is within and accessible to Wood Green and local facilities.</p> <p>Members felt it was prudent to defer the decision on this application for a site visit and in doing so felt it was also appropriate to visit at the same time the site of 103 Cornwall Road N15.</p> <p>6. 103 Cornwall Road N15</p> <p>This item was not considered and deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<p>PASC41.</p>	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>None received.</p>	
<p>PASC42.</p>	<p>SITE VISITS</p> <p>Unit 2, 4 & 5, 103 – 149 Cornwall Road & Land Adjoining 2 Falmer Road N15</p> <p>A site visit will be confirmed to take place on Friday 8 September 2006 at 9:30am at the site. Members also agreed to look at the site of the application for 103 Cornwall Road N15 at this time.</p>	
<p>PASC43.</p>	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the meeting scheduled to take place on 31 August 2006 be cancelled and the business for that meeting be re-scheduled to the next meeting on 11 September 2006 at 7pm.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The meeting concluded at 10:45pm.</p> <p>Attached schedule as Annex A</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006**

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK

Chair