

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

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

Also Present: Councillors Egan, Oakes and Winskill

\* Members present

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PASC75.</b>	<p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillor Dodds for whom Councillor Egan was substituting and from Councillor Weber for whom Councillor Oakes was substituting. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Oakes.</p>	
<b>PASC76.</b>	<p><b>URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>In accordance with standing order 32 (6) no business other than that listed shall be transacted at the meeting.</p>	
<b>PASC77.</b>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>Cllr Egan declared an interest in the decision to be taken under item 8. "I had applied to speak against this application when it first appeared on the agenda. I am also a member of the Avenue Gardens Residents Association who made an objection to this application. I will therefore absent myself from the meeting when this item is considered".</p>	
<b>PASC78.</b>	<p><b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b></p> <p>None received.</p>	
<b>PASC79.</b>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>Members were asked to note the decisions taken under delegated powers between 7 August and 17 September 2006. The figures for August detailed one major case. The Authority was endeavouring to manage major cases and minor applications were above Government targets however, we were slightly below our own targets which were being addressed.</p>	
<b>PASC80.</b>	<p><b>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</b></p> <p>The Committee were asked to note the decisions taken within set time targets by Development Control, Building Control and Planning Enforcement Action since the 11 September 2006. The August performance shows the Authority was not reaching Government targets. The yearly performance shows a requirement to be at a lower</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

	<p>percentage than the current figures and the Authority were putting in measures to deal with this.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That Members note the report.</p>	
<p><b>PASC81.</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the decisions of the Sub Committee on the planning applications and related matters, be approved or refused with the following points noted.</p>	
<p><b>PASC82.</b></p>	<p><b>REFERENCE FROM PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE (28/09/2006): UNITS 1 &amp; 2 QUICKSILVER PLACE, WESTERN ROAD N22</b></p> <p>Cllr Egan left the proceedings for consideration of item 8.</p> <p>The Committee were advised that this application site was a large commercial building which used to be Middlesex University. The proposal was a change of use to a Police Patrol base. The proposed plan details a total of 27 external car parking spaces for use by operational vehicles and visitors only. The conversion of the building to the Police Patrol Base would be temporary.</p> <p>An objector spoke on behalf of local residents and outlined reasons why the application shouldn't be granted for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety of pedestrians</li> <li>2. No direct access to strategic road networks</li> <li>3. Near a primary school and proposed new secondary school</li> <li>4. Part of the protected Heartlands Access Route</li> <li>5. The proposal would cause parking stress</li> </ol> <p>Cllr Oakes entered the meeting.</p> <p>The applicant's representative responded by advising the Committee that the application was only for a temporary period whilst works were being carried out to Wood Green Police Station. The applicant had secured a lease for a 5 year period, however it was anticipated that the site would not be used for this length of time.</p> <p>The schools had been consulted on the proposed change of use of the site and they had made no representations. The proposal would bring a currently vacant property back into use and also the police presence in the area would bring safety into the area.</p> <p>Members of the Committee discussed in detail the use of emergency vehicles speeding from the site, the use of sirens and flashing lights and whether alternative locations had been considered.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

Members decided to grant the application subject to conditions.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/1213  
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 12/10/2006

Location: Units 1 and 2 Quicksilver Place, Western Road N22

Proposal: Change of use of property to police patrol base (sui generis) with associated installation of CCTV cameras, window guards and replacement entrance gates.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions.

Decision: Grant subject to conditions.

Drawing No.s 217-MPAPB-PLAN-G-001, 217-MPAPB-PLAN-EX-ELEV-A-B-C-004, 217-MPAPB-PLAN-EX-ELEV-D-E-F-005, 217-MPAPB-PLAN-PR-PLAN-G-008, 217-MPAPB-PLAN-PR-ELEV-A-B-C-010, 217-MPAPB-PLAN-PR-ELEV-D-E-F-011 & planning support statement dated June 2006.

**Conditions**

1. The permission shall be granted for a limited period expiring on 12th October 2009; further the permission hereby granted shall not ensure for the benefit of the land but shall be personal to Metropolitan Police Authority only, and upon the Metropolitan Police Authority ceasing to use the land the use shall be discontinued and shall revert to the authorised use of General Industrial (B2).

Reason: Permission has only been granted with respect to the special personal circumstances of the applicant and would not otherwise be granted.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The temporary use of the property as a police patrol base would involve only minor changes to the existing building and property and is not considered to constitute a major redevelopment of the site. The temporary nature of the use and minor physical changes to the site would not prevent or discourage future redevelopment or use of the site that could contribute to the regeneration of the Haringey Heartlands Area. The proposed development not considered contrary to Policies AC1 'The Heartlands / Wood Green', EMP1 'Defined Employment Areas - Regeneration Areas' and EMP2 'Defined Employment Areas - Industrial Locations'.

Section 106 - No

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

Cllr Egan re-entered the proceedings.

Members noted that this application had been before the Committee on two previous occasions for the development of the site as well as two dismissed appeals. This scheme attempted to overcome the concern of the last inspector of potential overlooking of properties in Elm Grove and Tregaron Avenue. The main change was the number of units being reduced from 6 to 5 and overlooking windows had been omitted. The proposal would have a low profile design in density and size for a backland site.

Objectors spoke on behalf of Cecile Park and Tregaron Avenue residents. Their main concerns for objecting to the application was the degree of overlooking and the development's detrimental effect to the loss of privacy to Cecile Park rear gardens and 11 Elm Grove and the loss of open space. They also pointed out that the previous scheme was for 6 x 2 bedroom houses and the current scheme is for 5 x 3 bedroom houses with 10 foot rear gardens. Other concerns raised included unacceptable high mansard roofs, access for emergency vehicles, access for refuse collection would be difficult along the narrow entrance if congested by parked cars. There would also be risk of damage to mature trees (some with TPOs) in the Conservation Area.

Cllr Winskill spoke on behalf of residents objecting to this application and highlighted two concerns, conservation and parking. A previous application for a dormer window had been refused due to overlooking, so how could this application be recommended to be granted. The 40 lock up garages were much needed in a pressurised parking area and extreme parking stress is experienced and this leads to a demand for crossovers.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee and advised the planning report was developed along side planning officers and had endeavoured to satisfy planning policies. The matter of concern raised by the last inspector was the potential overlooking of properties. This had been addressed by the omission of any first storey windows to Tregaron Avenue.

Members questioned the applicant and officers on the proposals and issues raised overall and decided to refuse the application on the following grounds:

1. High mansard roof increasing overlooking to Cecile Park housing.
2. The recommendations of the Hornsey CAAC officer.
3. Loss of parking spaces on Cecile Park.
4. Quality of the design.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0580  
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 12/10/2006

Location: Land Rear Of 27- 47 Cecile Park N8

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

	<p>Proposal: Demolition of existing 39 garages and erection of 5 x 2 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 10 no. parking spaces.</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and S106 Legal Agreement.</p> <p>Decision: Refuse</p> <p>Drawing No.s 2873 P01 rev B &amp; P02 rev B.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>1. The site is of very limited depth and occupies a backland site in the Crouch End Conservation Area. By reason of their prominent mansard roofs which are untypical of the Conservation Area, and their sitting very close to the southern boundary of the site, the proposed dwellings would have a cramped appearance within the site and be visually intrusive to adjacent properties particularly in Tregaron Avenue and Elm Grove. Further, there would be mutual overlooking between the first floor bedroom windows and ground floor lounge windows in the flank walls of some of the proposed new dwellings.</p> <p>As such the scheme would not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area, and would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residents, contrary to Policies UD3(b) General Principles; UD4 Quality Design: CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas, and SPG1a Design Guidance, of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p>	
<p><b>PASC84.</b></p>	<p><b>LAND REAR OF 27-47 CECILE PARK N8</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the above demolition. The Committee refused to grant conservation area consent subject to conditions as planning permission for the above application was not granted.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0582 FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 12/10/2006</p> <p>Location: Land Rear Of 27 - 47 Cecile Park N8</p> <p>Proposal: Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing 39 garages and erection of 5 x 2 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 10 no. parking spaces.</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions &amp; S106 Legal Agreement.</p> <p>Decision: Refuse</p> <p>Drawing No.s: 2873 P01 rev B, P02 rev B</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>1. In the absence of an approved scheme for the permanent redevelopment of</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

	<p>the site, the demolition of the existing lock-up garages would result in the site having a derelict appearance which would detract from the appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area and would thus be contrary to Policy CSV 7 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p>	
<p><b>PASC85.</b></p>	<p><b>TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS</b></p> <p>The Chair moved that there be a variation to the order of the agenda. Members agreed to vary the order of the agenda and take item 13 before item 11.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the following Tree Preservation Orders be confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36A Alexandra Park Road N10</li> <li>• 1-12 Hamilton Place, 29A Woodside Gardens N17</li> <li>• Copper Beeches, North Grove N6</li> <li>• 44 Stanhope Gardens N6</li> </ul>	
<p><b>PASC86.</b></p>	<p><b>ALBERT WORKS, SPENCER ROAD N8</b></p> <p>Officers presented the report and stated that the proposed scheme was the same size as the previous granted scheme. The current development involved the creation of an additional unit by subdividing one of the approved units into two separate units. The Transportation Group had expressed concern that the vehicular access is narrow however, they had no concerns over the previous planning application which had been granted approval.</p> <p>The Committee heard from objectors to the application who felt the opening to the site was quite small. Concerns were raised about the loss of amenity and increased traffic. This development would encourage more cars into the area when it was well served by public transport. Concern was also raised about the level of noise which would increase as previously there was a proposal for a property with seven bedrooms and the current proposal was for a property with 11 bedrooms. Members were also advised that litter along Harvey and Spencer Roads was a problem due to wheelie bins being kept on the pavement.</p> <p>Cllr Winskill addressed the Committee and advised that this proposal was the fourth planning application for this site. Residents had previously objected on the grounds that there would be loss of light and the impact on traffic. The current proposal detailed an increase in the number of units. This new application was for 11 bedrooms and 6 car parking spaces. The property is located in a Cul-de-Sac so there would be parking problems and pressure.</p> <p>The applicant spoke and reiterated that this application was a partial demolition as in the original scheme to retain side and back walls. The increase in the number of rooms came about from redesigning the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

ground floor which made it more usable and no additional space was created. The footprint remains exactly the same. The current proposal was an improvement to the site and the overall scheme is exactly as it was before with the addition of one unit which would not cause issues of parking.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the increase in the number of rooms from six to eleven and was reassured that the size of the rooms met Haringey's size standards.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0922  
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 12/10/2006

Location: Albert Works, Spencer Road N8

Proposal: Erection of 4 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom house, part single part two storeys in height with front and rear roof lights car parking and landscaping.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions & S106 Legal Agreement.

Decision: Grant subject to conditions & S106 Legal Agreement.

Drawing No.s GVBS 1434 - 500A, 501 & 502.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood.

4. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

5. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.

6. A scheme for the treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development including the planting of trees and/or shrubs shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to provide a suitable setting for the proposed development in the interests of visual amenity.

7. Details of a scheme depicting those areas to be treated by means of hard landscaping shall be submitted to, approved in writing by, and implemented in accordance with the approved details. Such a scheme to include a detailed drawing of those areas of the development to be so treated, a schedule of proposed materials and samples to be submitted for written approval on request from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development has satisfactory landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

8. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town & Country Planning General Development Order 1988, no extensions falling within Class A and B shall be carried out without the submission of a particular planning application to the Local Planning authority for its determination.

Reason: In order to avoid overdevelopment of the site.

10. That details of a scheme for the shared vehicle/pedestrian/cycle access to the site, including details of a raised table at Spencer Road site access point and appropriate materials for the shared surface shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the works commence.

Reason: In order to ensure that the access to the site is satisfactory in relation to highway safety and free flow of traffic and pedestrians.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposal is for creation of an additional unit to the already approved scheme. The additional unit is to fit in the same footprint with the approved scheme with no window (s) to the rear elevation facing the back of properties along Oakley Road. The additional unit would increase the density on the site. It is however thought that the additional unit would not detract from the



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

	<p>character of amenity of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be in compliance with the provision of policies UD3 'General Principles' and HSG9 'Density Standards' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106 - Yes</p>	
<p><b>PASC87.</b></p>	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO 48 ELIZABETH PLACE N15</b></p> <p>The Committee were informed that this proposal sought the erection of five, two storey houses. Officers had received no representations to the proposal from residents or the transportation group. However, comments had been received from the Arboriculturalist who stated there was a row of mature trees in the rear gardens of adjacent properties, which were visible from a public place, provided a screen to the site and were of high amenity value. A condition had been included to protection these trees.</p> <p>Members raised concerns over the materials to be used in the development. They requested reassurance that the bricks to be used matched those of the building on either side of the site. Officers confirmed that condition 3 covered this issue.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to Section 106 agreement and conditions.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/1504 FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 12/10/2006</p> <p>Location: Land Adjacent To 48 Elizabeth Place N15</p> <p>Proposal Erection of 5 x 2 storey houses (2 x three bed, 2 x two bed and 1 x four bed houses) in 2 blocks</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions &amp; S106 Legal Agreement</p> <p>Decision: Grant subject to conditions &amp; S106 Legal Agreement.</p> <p>Drawing No.s 30223/P01C, 02A, 03A, 04B 7 05A.</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <p>1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect. Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning &amp; Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.</p> <p>2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

5. That not more than 5 separate houses, shall be constructed on the site.

Reason: In order to avoid overdevelopment of the site.

6. The building proposed by the development hereby authorised shall comply with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and comply with the aims and objectives of the police requirement of 'Secured By Design' & 'Designing Out Crime' principles.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development achieves the required crime prevention elements as detailed by Circular 5/94 'Planning Out Crime'.

7. Details of the proposed foundations in connection with the development hereby approved and any excavation for services shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the building works.

Reason: In order to safeguard the root systems of those trees on the site which are to remain after building works are completed in the interests of visual amenity.

8. Before any works herein permitted are commenced, all those trees to be retained, as indicated on the approved drawings, shall be protected by secure, stout, exclusion fencing erected at a minimum distance equivalent to the branch spread of the trees and in accordance with BS 5837:2005 and to a suitable height. Any works connected with the approved scheme within the branch spread of the trees shall be by hand only. No storage of materials, supplies or plant machinery shall be stored, parked, or allowed access beneath the branch spread of the trees or within the exclusion fencing.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

9. The works required in connection with the protection of trees on the site shall be carried out only under the supervision of the Council's Arboriculturalist. Such works to be completed to the satisfaction of the Arboriculturalist acting on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate protective measures are implemented to satisfactory standards prior to the commencement of works in order to safeguard

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

	<p>the existing trees on the site.</p> <p>10. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE: The new development will require naming/numbering. The applicant should contact the Transportation Group at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that in the interests of the security of the development hereby authorised that all works should comply with BS 8220 (1986), Part 1 - 'Security Of Residential Buildings'.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE: Details of the foundation work on the boundaries and any border treatment should be agreed with the adjoining occupiers before such works commence.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE: That notwithstanding the description of the materials on the approved drawings that the bricks submitted in relation to the proposed development in connection with Condition 3 (materials) attached to the planning permission shall match the adjoining properties. The Committee suggested that as two different brick types had been suggested one brick should match the adjoining existing residential buildings, the other should match the brickwork on the scheme under construction nearby. It was also suggested that the brickwork of the end flank walls should be designed to be patterned by mixing the brick types to relieve the otherwise potentially bland nature of these elevations.</p> <p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>The proposal complies with policies UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction, UD3 General Principles, UD4 'Good Design', HSG9 Density Standards, EMP5 Promoting Employment Uses, M10 Parking for Development of Haringey Unitary Development and appropriate Supplementary Guidance.</p> <p>Section 106 - yes</p>	
<p><b>PASC88.</b></p>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 30 October 2006 at 7:00pm.</p> <p>The meeting ended at 10:15pm</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2006**

---

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK

Chair