

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

Councillors Davidson (Chair), Bevan (Deputy Chair), Adamou, Basu, Engert, Hare, Newton, Peacock, Rice and Santry

Apologies Councillor Dodds

Also Present: Councillor (none)

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>TEPG01.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (IF ANY)</b>  Apologies were received from Cllr Dodds	
<b>TEPG02.</b>	<b>ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b>  The Chair advised that, due to the current upgrade of Haringey's web site, there had been an 'upload freeze' for the past week. Members of the public could log on and download sets of meetings and reports up to 10 <sup>th</sup> October but the documents for 31 <sup>st</sup> October could not be viewed until the end of the week.  Everyone present was advised that the meeting was subject to a live webcast and by entering the room and using the public seating area; they would be consenting to being filmed.	
<b>TEPG03.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  Cllr Basu declared a prejudicial interest with regard to the application for 381-481 Seven Sisters Road as he had previously expressed an opinion on this item at a Development Control Forum. He decided to leave the room when this item was discussed	
<b>TEPG04.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b>  None received	
<b>TEPG05.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>  That the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub Committees on 4 <sup>th</sup> October and 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2005 be agreed and signed.	
<b>TEPG06.</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL, BUILDING CONTROL AND PLANNING ENFORCEMENT</b> Members noted that all targets had been met, with the exception of minor applications which were above Government targets but below	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

	<p>Haringey targets. Appeals were slightly above Government targets but below Haringey targets. Members were also advised that an Appeal was pending for the application on Ferme Park Depot (heard at the last meeting of PASC on 10 October).</p>	
<p><b>TEPG07.</b></p>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>Noted</p>	
<p><b>TEPG08.</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, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes, be approved or refused, with the following points noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The Lodge, Creighton Avenue N10</b> <p>Having looked in detail at the site plans, members had some concerns that this development could be overlooking and therefore decided to defer a decision until after a site visit.</p> </li> <li><b>2. Oakdale Arms, 283 Hermitage Road N4</b> <p>Officers presented this application and members were asked to note that the demolition of the public house was not subject to planning permission and the proposed density levels for the redevelopment were within the London Plan standard.</p> <p>The ward councillor and several objectors spoke outlining their concerns at the loss of this public house and the proposed redevelopment. Members noted that the premises had been designated 'CAMRA North London Pub of the Year' and it was highly regarded by the local residents and felt to be at the hub of the local community.</p> <p>The retired Vicar of St Ann's Parish confirmed that the Oakdale Arms was used as a 'church plant', i.e. a community facility attached to the local church and services were held in their function rooms every Sunday morning. The local Trades Council and NDC representatives also felt that the Oakdale Arms added value to the local community and members noted that the function rooms were also used by a local group for people with disabilities.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that protecting community facilities was an objective of the London Plan but members were asked to be mindful that the premises was categorised as within Use</p> </li> </ol>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

Class A3 in Planning Terms (not D use; i.e. as a community facility) and that realistically the religious use could only be regarded as ancillary. Members were also reminded that planning applications could be made whether or not the land had been purchased.

Objectors felt that housing development was saturated in this area and it was alleged that there had been difficulty selling some of the recent developments which were now subject to large scale lettings. They were particularly concerned that the proposed basement area and underground parking could make the entrance to the development undesirable. This concern was also shared with members; as well as the design and use of materials. Members were concerned generally about underground parking in the borough unless it was subject to stringent surveillance and maintenance.

The applicant's agent felt that he had addressed previous concerns about height, mass and bulk and members noted that the redevelopment complied with UDP Policy on regeneration. Underground parking had been included in the development as the applicant felt that current on street parking was hazardous. As the applicant was not present, he felt that he could not answer the queries about surveillance and maintenance. However, members were reminded of the recent application re Somerset Halls (to be updated further at item 9 on this agenda) whereby building maintenance had been written into the 106 agreement.

There was some discussion as to whether the 'quirky' the design of the public house could warrant Listed Building Status. Officers advised that a similar premises in the borough had been refused but any member of the public would be at liberty to apply for this if they felt it appropriate. Cllr Hare said that he would support such an application as the lintels for the rear features are all original.

Members agreed that the application be refused on the grounds of height, bulk, design and the fact that it was not in keeping with the Street Scene.

Although members were sympathetic that this application represented the loss of a valued community facility, this was not sufficient to refuse the application on such grounds. However, it was noted that protection of community facilities is referred to in emerging UDP guidance and this would be noted where appropriate in the future.

**3. 381 – 481 Seven Sisters Road N15**

Officers advised members of an error on page 84 of the report in that *'12 units be made available for active, elderly people*

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

*through the Hornsey Housing Trust*'. Councillor Peacock advised the committee of an error in the planning history of this application (on page 69 of the report) in that the original 1960's terrace was demolished as part of the Seven Sisters Road dual-carriage way scheme, and that was the reason why the terrace faced away from the road.

An objector spoke setting out his concerns regarding the potential loss of amenity from this development. Members noted that local residents' concerns about overdevelopment had been raised at a recent Development Control Forum.

The applicant spoke in support of the development and advised members that he felt the proposals would benefit local regeneration and could potentially reduce anti-social behaviour on the site by enhancing an undesirable alleyway with lighting and landscaping. He confirmed that he had worked with local schools during the consultation exercise and had addressed concerns about overlooking. He had also been engaged in the Masterplan for the Tiverton Estate and in discussions with ward members. The resultant figures for housing mix had been arrived at following consultation with the Director of Housing. He confirmed that no trees would be disturbed as a result of the redevelopment.

Members had concerns about the residential use for the elderly but the applicant and officers confirmed that it was designed for the active elderly (i.e. 45 plus age group and not the infirmed 70 plus) so their requirements were different. Officers confirmed that this Housing Association were particularly experienced in housing provision for this age group.

Members also raised concerns about the use of copper cladding, whether 4 storeys was appropriate for a corner development and that an appropriate mix for the East of the Borough should be 70% key worker, owner occupier and shared ownership. Cllr Bevan asked for his opinion on housing mix in the East of the Borough to be recorded.

The applicant confirmed that the copper proposed for the development was of durable quality in a pre-patterned, slightly oxidised texture which was already stabilised and would not deteriorate. The potential flooding risk was being assessed and resolved by engineers but certain renewable energy features were not possible due to the location of the site and the close proximity of the trees but he agreed to engage an energy provider who used renewable sources. He confirmed that a lift would serve all floors and that a structural engineer had been engaged to ensure safe construction in the proximity of Seven Sisters underground station.

Cllr Hare asked members to be mindful of the Atkins Open Space Study which depicted areas of green space deficiency in this location; the area around this site was clearly visible

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

	<p>on the maps.</p> <p>Members decided to refuse the application on the grounds of it being out of character with the streetscape, loss of open/green space, over- development, overbearing, and the lack of a 70/30% split i.e. 70% for intermediate housing in the East of the Borough. However, members stressed that despite the refusal, for the reasons set out above, they felt that the design was thoughtful and interesting and had clearly been subject to very wide consultation.</p>	
<p><b>TEPG09.</b></p>	<p><b>SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS AND REASONS</b></p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2005/1592 FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 31/10/2005</p> <p>Location: 381- 481 Seven Sisters Road N15</p> <p>Proposal Demolition of existing garages and erection of four x part 3 / part 4 storey blocks comprising 28 x 1 bed, 30 x 2 bed and 10 x 3 bed residential units with associated landscaping.</p> <p>Recommendation Grant subject to conditions &amp; Section 106 Legal Agreement.</p> <p>Decision: Refuse</p> <p>Drawing Nos. P-102-01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12 &amp; 13.</p> <p>Reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed development represents overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality contrary to Policy DES 1.10 'Overdevelopment' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan by reason of the overall height, unbroken massing, bulk and size in a prominent location in the streetscape thereby causing demonstrable harm.</li> <li>2. The proposed development would be overbearing particularly in relation to the properties at the rear in Pulford Road and would result in loss of light and visual intrusion to the detriment of the amenities of those properties contrary to Policy DES 1.9 'Privacy &amp; Amenity Of Neighbours'.</li> <li>3. The proposed development would result in the loss of valuable public and informal urban open space which together with other nearby spaces performs a valuable function of relief from urban development in the street scene contrary to Policies OP 1.1 'Protection Of Urban Open Space', OP 1.2 'Informal Open Space', OP 2.1 'Public Open Space' and DES 1.6 'Urban Design, The Design Of Public Space &amp; Street Furniture' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</li> <li>4. The proposed development would not result in 7% of the proposed units of accommodation being provided for shared ownership / key worker (intermediate) housing contrary to Policies HSG 2.23 'Affordable</li> </ol>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

Housing' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and HSG 4 'Affordable Housing' in the Revised Deposit Consultation Draft Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2005/0734  
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED  
31/10/2005

Location: Oakdale Arms 283 Hermitage Road N4

Proposal Demolition of existing building and erection of a three storey building comprising 4 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed, 2 x 3 bed self contained flats and parking at basement level.

Recommendation Grant subject to conditions & Section 106 Legal Agreement

Decision REFUSE

Drawing No.s P/017, P/018, P/019 & P/020.

Reasons

1. The proposed development represents overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality contrary to Policy DES 1.10 'Overdevelopment' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan by reason of overall height, bulk and size in a prominent location in the street scene thereby causing demonstrable harm.

2. The development would be visually intrusive when viewed from adjoining properties by reason of bulk, overall scale, massing and design thereby contrary to Policies

DES 1.1 'Good Design & How Design Will Be Assessed'

DES 1.2 'Assessment Of Design Quality (1): Fitting New Buildings Into The Surrounding Area'.

DES 1.3 'Assessment Of Design Quality (2): Enclosure, Height & Scale'.

DES 1.4 'Assessment Of Design Quality (3) Building Lines, Layout, Form, Rhythm & Massing' and

DES 1.5 'Assessment Of Design Quality (4) : 'Detailing & Materials'.

of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

**TEPG10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - 28 NOVEMBER 2005, 7PM**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 31 OCTOBER 2005**

---

COUNCILLOR THOMAS DAVIDSON

Chair