

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

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

Apologies Councillor Hare

Also Present: Councillor **Error! No document variable supplied.**

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PASC111	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies were received from Cllr Hare	
PASC112	URGENT BUSINESS None	
PASC113	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST Cllr Santry declared a prejudicial interest in respect of 315 The Roundway as she had previously made a representation on a similar application and also in respect of the application on Middlesex University as she was a member of the temporary governing body. She decided to leave the room when these items were discussed and decided on.	
PASC114	DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS A petition had been received from Local Residents with regard to Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road N8. This application had since been withdrawn and would not appear on tonight's agenda	
PASC115	MINUTES That the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub Committees on 27 February 2006 be agreed and signed.	
PASC116	PERFORMANCE STATISTICS Members noted that the statistics for major and minor applications were above the Haringey and Government targets and that a detailed report on planning enforcement policy issues and statistics would be brought to the first PASC of the new Municipal Year; provisionally 5 June 2006.	
PASC117	DELEGATED DECISIONS	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

	<p>In response to a member's question about the conversions into 1 bed units with no parking, officers advised that as these were above commercial premises the decision was within planning regulations.</p>	
<p>PASC118</p>	<p>APPEAL DECISIONS</p> <p>Officers were especially pleased that the 2 appeals being reported had been the subject of a second refusal.</p>	
<p>PASC119</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>RESOLVED</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> <p>Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road N8 This application had been withdrawn.</p> <p>314 High Road, N22 8JR Members noted that this application had been granted conditional permission but that amended plans had been submitted. No objectors were present and the Chair commented that the amendments showed considerable improvement. Members agreed the application, subject to conditions, with the amended plans and with an extra condition for a shared satellite dish.</p> <p>673 Lordship Lane, N22 5LA Members noted that amended elevational plans had been submitted for this application. No objectors were present. Members agreed the application subject to conditions and section 106 agreement and an extra security condition for a door entry system. In answer to members questions about car parking, officers explained this was a car free development (in line with current Government Policy); that only 5 car spaces would be provided, with no CPZ permits and that a communal satellite dish was also included in the conditions.</p> <p>Hornsey Treatment Works, High Street N8 Members were advised that this item had been discussed at a Development Control Forum on 15 December (the minutes of which were attached as an appendix to the report). The first scheme had been refused and members noted that the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

GLA were happier with the resubmission (their comments were also attached as an appendix to the report)

Three objectors spoke (2 from local residents groups and one from the Alexandra Palace Advisory Committee) and set out their concerns about potential pollution levels from increased traffic, the size and bulk of the development, the lack of a phase 2 plan, environmental impact generally, inappropriate proximity to Alexandra Palace and Park and chemical deliveries in close proximity of a residential area and local playscheme. The Alexandra Palace Advisory Committee representative tabled their objections and were also concerned that the conditions of the 1998 Pumping Station approval had not been complied with.

The local Ward Councillor and Executive Member for Children and Young People spoke and endorsed these concerns and were concerned as to the impact the development could have for many years to come.

The Chair reminded all members speaking at Planning Committee that the Council had now entered 'Purdah' (the period prior to the local elections) and therefore Committees were only meeting to fulfil statutory obligations; i.e planning and licensing applications, and members should therefore conduct themselves accordingly.

A representative from Thames Water spoke in support of the application and explained to members the Water Authority's obligations to ensure that bromate levels in drinking water were kept as low as possible as this chemical could be carcinogenic. The current treatment methods for bromate were not sustainable; a fact which had been verified by OFWAT and the Drinking Water Inspectorate. Phase 1 of the development was for a pre-treatment works and phase 2 would be to actually remove the bromate. The Water Authority had worked with planning officers and was respectful of the amenity of local residents but felt that water treatment had unique circumstances. They anticipated 1 delivery a day, with a worse case scenario of possibly 3, and all deliveries would be supervised by Thames Water staff. In response to members' queries about the feasibility of sinking the development and piping in the chemicals; the Thames Water Project Engineer said that, due to the presence of underground pipework, and because it would be unwise to put at risk the walls of the adjacent reservoir immediately to the north, it was not possible to sink the treatment plant any further, nor could they site it on another disused filter bed further away. To pipe in the chemicals would involve 4 separate pipes being laid, over a long distance, this could be unsightly and a security risk. Bringing in chemicals by tanker was the only option.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

Members decided to refuse the application on the grounds of design, height, bulk and proximity to the residential and play group area, loss of amenity on the conservation area and metropolitan open land and lack of 106 agreement and with an informative that any future submission should include information on phase 2.

51 Whymark Avenue, N22 6DJ

Members noted that this premises had been in use as a hostel for 4 years and agreed to grant temporary permission until 1 April 2008, subject to conditions and 106 agreement. In answer to members questions, officers replied that permission was personal and not transferable.

315 The Roundway, N17

Members noted that this application has been refused in May 2005 and had been the subject of an Appeal. Recent photographs of the key changes and minutes of recent DC and Design Forums, where this application had been discussed, were tabled. The Chair allowed members time to consider the points in these minutes as they had not had sight of the documents before the meeting. In response to members questions about provision of family units, officers advised that in response to local pressure, developers were now rewarded on the number of rooms provided and not just on the number of units.

Two objectors spoke and outlined their concerns about the height and bulk of the development, the impact on the 3 bordering conservation areas, the vehicle access through Church Road, the lack of family housing and amenity and generally their views that the development would be bad for Tottenham. The local Ward Councillor spoke supporting the objections; however, he felt that the area was derelict and in need of regeneration.

In answer to members' questions, officers advised that English Heritage had not expressed an opinion and that traffic management had no specific concerns. CABE had stated that although they supported this proposal; they preferred the first submission.

The applicant spoke and summarised the improvements made which were shown in the photographs tabled for members; i.e. reduced number of units, a greater expanse of brickwork, reduction in the building line (giving a wider pavement), reduction of the roof pitch, improved security, boundary treatment and tree planting. Members were advised that they had held 2 public exhibitions, local

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

meetings and posted some 2,000 leaflets consulting local residents.

In response to members' questions, the applicant advised that the development would have 2 separate bin stores (for refuse and recycling; accessible by a key fob) and a door entry system. There was no play area but they had proposed a section 106 contribution for environmental improvements to Bruce Castle Park.

Members felt that the improvements were not sufficient and decided to refuse the application on the grounds of size, design, mass, bulk, height, loss of amenity and character in context of the nearby conservation area and not in keeping with the street scene.

Members also expressed a view that the derelict site could be better served as one large area; possibly the subject of a CPO. Officers advised members of the new CPO Act which could be considered in similar cases in the future.

278-296 High Road, N15 4AJ

This application had already received planning permission, conditional on materials which members approved. Members were also advised that the extra drawing available at the meeting was different to the one despatched with the agenda and reports.

Former Council Depot, Stoneleigh Road N17

Members approved this application, subject to conditions, but expressed some concerns about the flat roof and quality of materials. In response to members' questions, the applicant advised that the timber finish had a 50 year Guarantee (documentary evidence of this would be produced for members' inspection); the black paint finish was anti-fly posting and anti-graffiti and that they would investigate the lifespan of polycarbon and report back to a future PASC. In response to concerns about the flat roof, members were advised that this had a 1 in 64 gradient (in accordance with building regulations).

Middlesex University, White Hart lane N17

This application asked members to discharge conditions in a previously approved planning permission. In response to members concerns about contamination; a series of emails addressing these were tabled. Although, not a planning consideration; the legal representative had investigated the possibility of indemnity insurance based on a risk assessment. With regard to materials; members felt that the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

	<p>colour scheme should be softened from stark white to a warmer tone. Members also remained concerned about the passage of lorries; so they agreed to defer the decision on this condition, under delegated powers, to the Assistant Director following further consultation with traffic management. The trees and methodology statements were agreed.</p>	
PASC120	<p>TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the following Tree Preservation Orders be confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Entrance to the Gas Works bordering 123 Hornsey Park Road N8 – agreed but members asked for the Arboriculturist to revisit the Silver Birches near the substation.• 17 Christchurch Road N8• 12-14 Southwood Lawn N6• 26 Crescent Road N8• 15 View Road N6• Tile Kiln Lane N6• 72 Palace Road N8 – members were asked to note that a damaged Beech on this site was the subject of enforcement action• Cedar Court, Colney Hatch Lane N10• 25 Truro Road N22• 42 Shepherds Hill N6• Southwood Park, Southwood Lawn Road N6• 2-4 Broadlands Road N6• 23A Albert Road N4• 30 Muswell Hill N10 – members were asked to note that this TPO was for 2 Ashes, not 1	
PASC121	<p>VOTE OF THANKS</p> <p>As this was the last meeting of the Planning Applications Sub Committee of the current administration and the 2005/6 Municipal Year; Members present offered a vote of thanks to the Chair and Officers for their support at PASC during the last year and administration. The Chair also paid tribute to the work of the planning committee and the team spirit in working with opposition members.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 27 MARCH 2006**

	The meeting ended at 11pm	
PASC122	DATE OF NEXT MEETING	

COUNCILLOR THOMAS DAVIDSON

Chair