

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

Councillors: *Peacock (Chair), *Adamou, *Alexander, *Bevan, *Beacham, *Dodds (Deputy Chair), *Hare, *Patel and *Weber

Also Present: Councillors Aitken and Egan

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PC161.	APOLOGIES There were no apologies for absence.	
PC162.	URGENT BUSINESS There were no items of urgent business.	
PC163.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST None received.	
PC164.	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS None received.	
PC165.	MINUTES The Committee was asked to agree the minutes of the Planning meeting held on 3 March 2008. RESOLVED That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 3 March 2008, be agreed and signed.	
PC166.	APPEAL DECISIONS The Committee noted the outcome of 18 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during February 2008, of which 10 (56%) were allowed and 8 (44%) were dismissed. The Committee was asked to note that there were 5 enforcement appeals, 3 were dismissed in Conservation Areas. An appeal for a place of worship in an industrial area was allowed however, this case was now the subject of a judicial review. The Committee was particularly asked to note that the appeal for 1 Mount Pleasant Villas N4 was allowed. This application was for the demolition of derelict garages and the erection of nine new houses set around a landscaped mews in a Conservation Area. This application had strongly been opposed however, the	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

	<p>Planning Inspector had allowed the appeal. The Inspector felt that the site could not be seen in the Conservation Area and would not have a significant impact or effect on Holly Park Estate. It was felt that the density was not significantly increased and fell within the development plan. The Inspector's decision was that the scheme was satisfactory and would not cause harm.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p>PC167.</p>	<p>DELEGATED DECISIONS</p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the decisions made under delegated powers by the Heads of Development Control (North and South) and the Chair of the Planning Committee determined between 11 February 2008 and 16 March 2008.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p>PC168.</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the performance statistics on Development Control and Planning Enforcement Work since the 3 March 2008 Planning Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Officer informed the Committee that one major application was determined within 13 weeks (100%) and (82%) of minor applications were determined within 8 weeks, slightly below the Haringey performance target. In respect of householder applications (92%) were determined within 8 weeks which was above the Haringey target.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p>PC169.</p>	<p>ARIELLA & BT SITE, 25 WATSONS ROAD N22</p> <p>The Committee was advised that this application site comprised of an area of land on the eastern part of the site formerly used by BT as a temporary car park and a large yard with a range of two storey buildings, all now vacant. The site was bordered by residential two storey terraced houses, a school playground and long gardens of properties on Bounds Green Road.</p> <p>This application sought to overcome the reasons for refusal of a previous application in 2005, for more houses and no commercial use. The redevelopment of the site would retain a proportion of</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

B1 space for commercial business.

The residential development of a mixed use scheme was considered to be appropriate for this site. The proposed density of the scheme was 433hrh, which was acceptable and in accordance with the adopted Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan. The proposal included affordable housing with provision of 47%. Overall the scheme proposed had been designed to respond to neighbouring street patterns and minimise the overlooking of neighbouring properties. The height and mass of the central block had been reduced by one floor and would not have an overbearing, dominant or detrimental impact on residential amenities to neighbouring occupiers.

The application included a number of proposals for uses of renewable energy, in particular solar heating panels. The proposal also included the provision of 13 car parking spaces, 11 for housing, 2 for commercial and 40 cycle racks.

The Committee questioned the provision of amenity space for the houses, and whether a lift was to be included within the block with four storeys. The Officer responded by informing the Committee that some of the houses had 48-49sqm, some had 35sqm and there was a large communal space in the middle of the development with over 300sqm. Blocks A and B flats had balconies and a share of the overall communal space.

The Committee further raised concern about the provision of sprinklers, access for waste removal and emergency vehicles. In response the Officer advised that there was a second alternative emergency access point beside the commercial building and that the width of the roads were adequate for emergency vehicles to turn around. Block C had satisfied the Fire Regulations as long as the proposal provided sprinklers.

Local residents addressed the Committee and objected to the application on the basis that:

- The development would cause overcrowding in the area.
- Blocks A and B were too high for the site and would adversely dominate the streetscape.
- The London Fire Authority was not satisfied with the scheme presented and problems were identified with blocks C and D.
- Overlooking would be caused because blocks A and B faced each other over a space of 14sqm.
- Any proposal for the site should respect the local environment and replicate this density.
- The scheme should be kept as a community proposal with more shops rather than more housing.
- The parking provision for the development was not

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

sufficient as there were already parking problems in the area.

- The recommendations of the Haringey design panel were not taken into consideration particularly in respect of Watsons Road which was considered to be dangerous.
- Housing development on the site would increase pedestrian traffic to and from the High Road along a narrow stretch of road which was actually two way for half its length.

In conclusion the objectors stated that the proposal was not good enough for the neighbourhood or its intended inhabitants.

Cllr Egan addressed the Committee in support of the objectors that the site, size and nature of the development had specific problems. The height and density remained an issue for local residents. The proposal would overshadow the cottages along Bounds Green Road. The scheme proposed mixed dwellings which would be overcrowded. The development provided 11 car parking spaces only which was considered to be insufficient. There was also concern regarding safety along Watson's Road.

The applicant addressed the Committee and responded to the concerns raised by objectors:

1. The Fire Officer was acceptable to the use of sprinklers.
2. The commercial use would be for B1 offices and not retail.
3. Block E had not been moved.
4. The transport officer was acceptable to the arrangements.
5. Dwelling sizes were acceptable and met the decent homes standards.
6. The full meeting of the Haringey Design Panel had increased the number of units to mixed dwellings.
7. Pitched roofs were added.
8. A consultant had further amended the scheme – block B was now 3 storeys instead of 4 and there were now 3 bed properties rather than 2 bed flats.
9. Parking was provided where the policy dictated it was not required.
10. The Impact on the Conservation Area was considered to be acceptable.

The applicant confirmed there would be fences on each of the gardens and that there were only two single aspect dwellings within the scheme.

The Committee enquired of the applicant whether the commercial floor space had been reduced and by how much. In response the applicant stated that the floor space had been reduced but did not have the figures however, it was comparable to the existing

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

space.

The Committee further queried whether a lift was to be provided in the 4 storey block, how the parking spaces were to be allocated and how the properties would be managed and maintained once completed. The applicant informed the meeting that there would be no lift in block A. The 8 remaining car parking spaces would be allocated on a first come first served basis for whomever applied and it was expected that they would be sold to the private houses buyers. The management of the development once completed would be shared with Presentation Housing Association.

A motion was moved to refuse the application on the grounds of layout, over development of the site, building design and its contrasting character on the area, effect on the street scene with emphasis on appearance and access. On being put to the vote there appeared 6 in favour and 1 against and the motion was declared carried.

RESOLVED

That the application be refused planning permission on the grounds of layout, over development of the site, building design and its contrasting character on the area, effect on the street scheme with emphasis on appearance and access. Loss of employment floor space, concern over traffic movements and inadequate parking and the absence of a Section 106 Agreement.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:
HGY/2008/0152
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 01/04/2008

Location: Ariella & BT Site,25 Watsons RoadN22 7TZ

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 1 x 4 storey block, 1 x 3 storey block, 2 x 2 1/2 storey blocks and 1 x 2 storey block to accommodate 60 residential units; erection of 1 x single storey commercial building (400 sqm) together with the provision of 11 car parking spaces, secure cycle parking spaces and associated landscaping (AMENDED DESCRIPTION + AMENDED PLANS)

Recommendation: GRANT

Decision: REF

Drawing No's: 3004PL_105a - 109a incl., 120a - 128a incl.

Conditions:

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

1. With the exception of the five storey Green Ridings House to the east, the area surrounding the application site is predominantly characterised by two storey residential property, and is bordered by the Trinity Gardens Conservation Area to the north. The proposed scheme, by reason of the height of the central blocks A and B, the proximity of Blocks A and B to each other, and the proximity of Blocks D and E to the property boundaries, would amount to overdevelopment of the site, visually intrusive within the street scene and having an overbearing presence when viewed from adjacent roads and gardens. The overdevelopment of the site would result in overlooking between windows in Blocks A and B, and from the rear of Block C over gardens of properties in Bounds Green Road; it would also result in the houses in Block E having a north facing aspect and minimal private amenity space. As such it would be contrary to Policies UD3 General Principles and UD4 Quality Design of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
2. The existing site is occupied by commercial buildings with a floorspace of over 1600 sq.m. The proposed replacement Class B1 floorspace of 400 sq.metres would not provide the same degree of employment –generating floorspace, and would thus not comply with Policy EMP 4; Non Employment Generating Uses, of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
3. The vehicle access to the site is provided from one access at a right –angled bend at the junction of Watson’s Road and Ringslade Road, which are already heavily trafficked narrow side roads in an area with significant on –street parking in residential streets. The proposed scheme entails the provision of 60 residential units and 400 sq.metres of Class B1 floorspace, but with a provision of only 13 off-street parking spaces to serve the whole development. The development would unacceptably increase the amount of vehicular traffic using Watsons Road and Ringslade Road, and would add to pressure on existing road side parking spaces within adjacent residential streets, to the detriment of the amenity of residents. As such the scheme would be contrary to Policy UD3 (c) General Principles of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan.
4. In the absence of a formal undertaking to secure a Section 106 Agreement for appropriate contribution towards Educational facilities, and contributions towards improvements at the site’s junction with Watsons Road and Ringslade and highway safety measures along Watsons road, the proposal is contrary to Policy UD10 ‘Planning Obligations’ of the Adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG 10a ‘The Negotiation , Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations’ and SPG 10c ‘Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development.’

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

	Section 106 No.	
PC170.	<p>159 TOTTENHAM LANE N8</p> <p>The officer stated there was additional information to be provided to the Committee prior to presenting the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There was a current appeal in relation to the previous application and the result was not yet know. 2. A letter dated 28 March, had been received from the applicant detailing minor revisions to the basement area at the back of the site. The drawings on display showed a reduction in the length of the basement area to protect the tress on the other side of the boundary with the properties in Fairfield Road. 3. The previously approved scheme was 11m in height at the front. The current application was 12 m in height at the front of the scheme. 4. Distances at the rear had been queried and there was a 38m distance between proposed development and the ground floor rear extension in Fairfield Road. The standard required by the SPG was 40m. 5. Page 100 of the report, transportation points 2-4 to be added as conditions of the permission if the Planning Committee decided to grant planning permission. 6. The existing planning permission on the site was dated 30 August 2005. <p>The Committee was informed that the site was a former petrol station situated on the southern side of Tottenham Lane. It was considered that the proposed shopping units were appropriate for this type of location adjacent to the Town centre. The overall scale and appearance was considered not to be detrimental of the immediate locality or the mixed character of the street scene and as such did not represent over development in relation to the area. The density of the proposed site was 445hrh considered acceptable and not excessive.</p> <p>It was considered that the proposed building would not lead to any adverse effect on neighbouring properties or occupiers. In relation to the size of the units, the scheme complied with the required space standards as set out in the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The scheme provided for 50% affordable units.</p> <p>The scheme proposed a fully accessible basement area for parking and included 20 cycle racks, 14 that would be enclosed with secure shelter and the remaining 6 under cover. There were also a number of sustainable elements including solar hot water, rain water harvesting, grey water, recycling along with recycled building materials where possible.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

Objectors addressed the Committee and requested that the application be refused on the following grounds:

- The height and depth of the development had not complied with the SPG Policy. The building would look like 5 storeys and not 4.
- The upper floors were set back and therefore had a detrimental effect on surrounding properties. Extra height had been provided on the retail space.
- The scale of the building, particularly at the front was 4 storeys and excessively bulky.
- The 2004/05 application was for a smaller building and that report had stated it was too high. This application was for a larger building.
- The officer's report did not take into consideration residents views.

A representative from the Hornsey CAAC advised the Committee that their views had been submitted and not included in the officers report. Concern was raised regarding excavation works which would put mature trees at risk. The representative questioned the requirement for two basement levels. The development would danger the appearance of the Conservation Area if approved and should be refused.

The Hornsey CAAC representative was asked whether he was in sympathy with the previously application and in response stated that this application was out of context with the surrounding building environment and would give a suppressive feel to the surrounding properties. The materials and horizontal nature at the front of the scheme were out of context in terms of height and bulk.

Cllr Aitken addressed the Committee and advised that the site had been vacant for a long time and the new design was not acceptable. The mix between residential and commercial use with only 26 parking spaces was considered to be insufficient as their was currently parking pressure in the area.

The applicant's representative informed the Committee that they had negotiated at great length and proposed a scheme which was felt would benefit Crouch End rather than harm the area. The scheme submitted was to meet the previous objections, was of a good design, had a better appearance to the building that had planning consent granted. The additional height to the building was 1m. The highways team were acceptable of the scheme and a tree survey had been carried out to take account of the trees beyond the site in residents rear gardens.

The Committee enquired of the applicant's representative why

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

they were proposing the current scheme and not the previous one granted. In response the Committee was informed that the previous scheme was not good in terms of financial viability and the present development provided for affordable housing.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application on a vote there being four in favour and five against the motion was lost.

RESOLVED

That the application be refused planning permission on the grounds of overlooking by adjoining properties by reason of bulk, height, design and materials. The proposed development represented over development of the site in relation to the surrounding area and properties in the locality. The application was also refused on the grounds that it does not meet the provisions for affordable housing or a Section 106 Agreement.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:
HGY/2008/0215
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 01/04/2008

Location: 159 Tottenham Lane N8 9BT

Proposal: Erection of 4 storey building over 2 basement levels comprising gym and storage at sub-basement, car parking in basement, retail unit at ground floor level, 5 x one bed, 6 x two bed, 2 x three bed flats and 3 x offices at third floor. (amended description).

Recommendation: GRANT

Decision: REF

Drawing No's: 0632_00_001, 101b, 101c, 102b, 102d, 103b, 103d, 104c, 105c, 106c, 108b, 120b, 121b, 122b, 123b, 124b and revised drawings reported verbally at planning committee: 101c, 102d & 103d.

Conditions:

1. The development would be visually intrusive when viewed from adjoining properties by reason of bulk, height design and materials, thereby contrary to Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed development represents overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality contrary to Policy UD3 'General Principles' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan by reason of the height, bulk, massing, design and materials resulting in an unsatisfactory relationship with the adjoining properties to the detriment of the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 1 APRIL 2008**

	<p>visual amenities of the street scene and the creation of unnecessary problems of overlooking and loss of privacy to adjacent properties thereby causing demonstrable harm.</p> <p>3. The proposed development does not include a formal undertaking to meet the costs of: 'The provision of affordable housing at 50% of the total units', an education contribution as required under SPG10c 'Education needs generated by new housing and the costs of Administering and Monitoring the undertaking contrary to Policy UD8 'Planning Obligations' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106 No.</p>	
PC171.	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>	
PC172.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Tuesday 6 May 2008.</p> <p>The meeting concluded at 9:15pm</p>	

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK
Chair