

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

Councillors: \*Peacock (Chair), Beacham, \*Dodds (Deputy Chair), \*Hare, \*Mallett, \*Patel  
\*Weber and Wilson

\* Denotes Members present

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PC217.</b>	<p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that at the time of despatch of the agenda Cllr Adamou was a Member on the Committee and had sent her apologies for the meeting. Apologies were also received from Cllr Beacham for whom Cllr Reid was substituting and from Cllr Wilson for whom Cllr Whyte was substituting. The Committee welcomed Cllr Demirci back to the Membership.</p>	
<b>PC218.</b>	<p><b>URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>	
<b>PC219.</b>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
<b>PC220.</b>	<p><b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b></p> <p>There were no deputations or petitions.</p>	
<b>PC221.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to agree the minutes of the Special Planning Committee held on 29 May 2008 and the Planning Committee held on 9 June 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the Special Planning Committee held on 29 May 2008 and the Planning Committee held on 9 June 2008 be agreed and signed.</p>	
<b>PC222.</b>	<p><b>APPEAL DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the outcome of 7 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during May 2008, of which 2 were allowed and 5 were dismissed. There were no particular appeals to point out to the Committee, however the service had exceeded the Government target by 29% which was considered to be very good.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>PC223.</b>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the decisions made under delegated powers by the Heads of Development Control (North &amp; South) and the Chair of the Planning Committee determined between 19 May 2008 and 29 June 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>PC224.</b>	<p><b>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the performance Statistics on Development Control and Planning Enforcement Work since the 9 June 2008 Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Officer informed the Committee that with respect to planning applications there were no major decisions determined in May 2008. In relation to minor applications 80% were determined in 8 weeks and for other applications 95% were determined within 8 weeks. The granted refusal rate for decisions determined in May was 69% were granted (90 out of 131) and 31% refused (76 out of 295). In terms of appeals against refusal of planning permission the government target was 30%, Haringey's target was 35% and in May the actual target was 33% between the two targets.</p> <p>Members requested that the performance statistics report be provided in a rolling 12 month period rather than the last 12 months in order to receive an historic picture of service performance in relations to all planning applications.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<b>PC225.</b>	<p><b>23 WOODSIDE AVENUE N6</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the application site was a two storey semi-detached house on the northern side of Woodside Avenue. The house had a nursery on the ground floor and a flat on the first floor. Residential properties adjoined the site to the north, south and west with Woodside Avenue bounding to the east.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

Planning permission was originally granted in December 2001, for the use of the ground floor of 23 Woodside Avenue as a Montessori school. The main consideration in this proposal was the extent to which allowing children to have additional time outside in the garden would cause an unacceptable increase in noise generation from the property detrimentally impacting on the amenity of nearby residential properties.

The premise was demonstrably well run and met a need in the wider community. It was considered that an additional 10 minutes in the morning and afternoon would not give rise to unreasonable additional levels of noise nuisance on nearby residential properties.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/0887  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 21/07/2008

Location: 23 Woodside Avenue N6

Proposal: Variation of Condition 8 (play times) attached to planning permission reference HGY/2001/1002 dated 12 December 2001, to extend morning and afternoon play times in the garden by 10 minutes each (an increase of 20 minutes per day in total).

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions

Decision: Grant subject to conditions

Drawing No's: No drawings.

Conditions:

1. The amount of time children are allowed to play in the rear garden is to be restricted to a maximum of 30 minutes in the morning and 30 minutes in the afternoon.

Reason: To protect the amenity of neighbouring and surrounding properties.

INFORMATIVE: This approval only amends Condition 8 of the previous consent HGY/2001/1002 issued on the site. Conditions 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13 of this previous approval remain valid and must be adhered to at all times. Amended Condition 8 must also be adhered to at all times.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>It is not considered likely the additional 10 minutes in the morning and 10 minutes in the afternoon for the children's playtime in the rear garden would give rise for unacceptable noise disturbance being created on nearby residential properties. As such, this proposal is considered to be in keeping with Policies UD3 'General Principles' and CW1 'New Community / Health Facilities' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006).</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p><b>PC226.</b></p>	<p><b>2~4 BROADLANDS ROAD N6</b></p> <p>The Planning Officer advised the Committee that Cllr Harris had tabled a letter with the agreement of the Chair.</p> <p>The Committee was further informed that there was an error on Condition 11, under Reason: the words 'and Parkland Walk' should be removed. The Highgate Society had asked that a further condition be added that a professional photograph of the property be taken before the demolition and be kept by the Society. As the building was part of the history of Highgate's development.</p> <p>The planning officer advised the Committee that a further condition was also to be added to the planning consent in relation to a Section 278 agreement. That no development would commence until the developer had entered into a Section 278 agreement that works would be undertaken to improve the section of footways in the interest of highways and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Representations had also been received from Building Control who advised that formal building regulations applied. Three local residents had submitted letters objecting to the proposed building being over large in terms of bulk, mass and layout. The style of the proposed development was not in keeping with either the style of buildings it was replacing nor the surrounding buildings. No construction traffic would be allowed to use Grange Road as it was a private road.</p> <p>The application site was occupied by two converted and extended villas known respectively as The Tree and Homfray House, and was a vacant nursing home. There was no prevailing architectural style in the area, being a mix of Victorian and Edwardian developments. The application site was located within Highgate Conservation Area, however the building was not listed.</p> <p>This application followed on from a recent refusal which was for a similar application for the demolition of the existing buildings on</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

site and the erection of a part 4 / part single storey building to accommodate 41 extra care units.

A fundamental component to the development of extra care schemes was that they must be near to local amenities and services. The Borough currently only had 60 such units and the provision of extra care housing had been identified as a priority in the Borough's 'Supporting People Strategy 2005-2010'. The project had the full support of the Council's Adult, Culture and Community Services. The self contained units were designed to be fully wheel chair accessible and compliant with Lifetime Home Standards.

The replacement building would be of a contemporary architectural design and its footprint would be similar to that of the existing buildings on site, with an additional single storey being built along the western boundary. The main building fronting onto Broadlands Road would take the form of 3 villas. The height of the North East corner of the building had been reduced by 3m, therefore minimising the impact on neighbouring Broadlands flats. The overall composition of the proposed development would consist of brick, and white render with some timber cladding. The reduction in height and proximity of the proposed building would not adversely affect the daylight and sunlight received to neighbouring properties. The scale, height, massing, alignment of the building, and its fenestration pattern had been redesigned sensitively to avoid adverse additional overlooking to neighbouring properties.

The site was populated with many trees (39 in total) of various ages and species, ten of which were the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. Four trees were categorised to be removed and a further seven classed of low quality and identified to be removed.

The Committee enquired what the changes were between the previously refused application and the current one before the Committee and whether the flat roof on the single storey structure would be made of cedar. In response the Committee was informed that the main difference between the two applications was the reduction of the height on the corner at the junction of Grange Road and Broadlands Road and the single storey structure would have cedar roofs.

An objector addressed the Committee and advised that he was representing 19 householders who primarily objected to the fourth storey. The reduction on the height of the single storey only benefited certain properties. The original reason for refusal of the first application was due to the height which was considered detrimental to neighbouring occupiers. There was no significant difference between the two application and therefore requested

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

that the entire 4<sup>th</sup> storey be removed completely. The second objector addressed the Committee and stated that officers, applicant nor agents had visited residents to assess the current site. The proposed balconies and side windows to the South East elevation of the planning application would look directly onto the gardens and rear windows of the flats on North Hill. Regardless that provision had been made for obscure windows and privacy screening the windows and balconies were considered to be too close. A request was made to retain the tree behind the property at 23 North Hill as it provided screening for residents.

The Committee queried whether overlooking would occur as the eventual occupants of the units would be frail and elderly. The objector replied that there would be balconies along the front which would overlook their back garden and sitting room.

The Applicants addressed the Committee and advised that they had taken into account the reason for refusal of the original application, in terms of a reduction in the number of units to be provided from 41 to 40 units in total and a reduction in the height of the building. The proposed development was considered to be a modern building which would integrate with the Conservation Area and provide community benefits. The scheme would benefit the elderly and provide extra care in the next few years.

The Committee queried the central block on Broadlands which appeared to be rendered, however it was noted that the predominant character of the buildings on both roads was of brick construction. The applicant was requested to reconsider reducing the white rendering and supplying a second type of brick. The applicant responded that the idea was to create a vision of separate villas, as the original refused plan was completely rendered. There were a number of rendered buildings in the locality, therefore the proposed application took into consideration the whole area and its character.

Members further queried whether it was possible to retain the tree behind 23 North Hill and were advised that the applicant was not against retaining any tree on the site and would reconsider this request. The Committee queried whether the applicant's proposal would increase the carbon footprint bearing in mind that it was an issue for the Director and Cabinet Member for the Environment to make Haringey a greener borough. The applicant stated that it was proposed to develop a building with high quality components, using low energy appliances and this was dealt with in condition 18. The Committee also enquired whether the Highgate Society had expressed a view with regard to the proposed development. In response the Committee was informed that there was a comprehensive response from the Highgate Society who stated that they had studied the revised application and debated the new application. They supported Hill

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p>Homes' view that the benefits of having the home in this form outweighed issues relating to the conservation area.</p> <p>The Committee requested that additional conditions be imposed in terms of landscaping the garden, fencing and shrubs to be provided along Grange Road.</p> <p>The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the application be granted and approved subject to conditions and the additional conditions requested.</p>	
<p><b>PC227.</b></p>	<p><b>2~4 BROADLANDS ROAD N6 ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</b></p> <p>The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the existing building had undergone substantial external redevelopment by way of unsympathetic additions and its contribution to the Conservation Area had been eroded. The existing building made a 'neutral' contribution to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The substantial community benefit associated with this proposal was considered to represent an exceptional case and the argument for the demolition was considered acceptable.</p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of part 4 / part single storey building to accommodate 40 extra care units and provision of 9 off-street parking spaces.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That Conservation Area Consent be granted for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a part 4 / part single storey building to accommodate 40 extra care units and provision of 9 off-street parking spaces as the application outlined in PC was granted.</p> <p>Cllr Bevan entered the meeting at 20:20hrs.</p>	
<p><b>PC228.</b></p>	<p><b>PLAYGROUND SITE, ADJOINING STAINBY ROAD, MONUMENT WAY N15</b></p> <p>Cllr Bevan entered the meeting at 8:20pm.</p> <p>The Planning Officer presented the report and advised that this application site was previously approved as part of the original plans for Saltram Close. The site was an enclosed semi derelict</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

playground, originally designed for the use of Saltram Close Estate. The site was bounded directly to the north by Monument Way and Saltram Close Estate formed the south boundary. Stainby Road lay to the east of the site.

The site was currently derelict and unsafe for its original purpose, it was considered that the proposed change of use to residential was acceptable. The density was approximately 414hrh, within the density range set out in the UDP and London Plan. The units were designed to conform to 'Lifetime Homes Standards' and 10% had wheelchair access.

The scheme would provide not less than 50% of the total units for affordable housing, however the units would be for renting because the Housing Enabling Team had identified a shortage of large units for renting purposes. The proposed scheme was modern in design and would connect with the design approach of the adjacent development on the former Rose & Crown Public House, and nearby new developments. It was considered that the height and scale conformed to existing buildings and should not have an adverse effect on the surrounding area.

The flats within the scheme would be 'car-free' with 9 covered and secured bicycle storage facilities and each of the six houses would have the provision of one car parking space per unit and secure bicycle stand. Amenity space had been designed into the scheme in the form of rear garden space, balcony and terrace for all the houses. The flat units had provision of ground floor patio, balconies and a secured roof garden.

Cllrs Amin and Diakides entered the meeting at 8:30 and 8:31 respectively.

The Committee questioned why the existing planning permission for the site was not implemented and were advised that the permission was still valid, however legal services had advised that a new application be resubmitted because it would have a fresh Section 106 agreement. Concern was raised regarding the fact that the site was on a gyratory system and what measures had been considered to address issues such as noise. The Officer replied that specific measures had been adopted near the rear boundary walls of the scheme and also specific windows would be installed to prevent noise intrusion. The Committee could condition that an acoustic report be produced to address this issue. Members further enquired about where the car parking spaces would be provided and whether the extra height of the proposed development would have an effect on the properties in Saltram Close. The Committee was informed that parking spaces would be provided in the front garden for each of the houses. The height of the development to the north would have the sun moving round the estate so therefore no loss of sun or



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

daylight. The Committee further raised concerns in relation to the roof top garden and considered it was no place for children to play, particularly as there would be a level of noise, pollution from traffic, and whether the Section 106 money could be used to provide a play space elsewhere. The Committee was assured that roof top gardens were perfectly safe for children to play in and that some schools in the borough already had them. The Officer explained that during the consultation there was no consensus regarding the provision of the roof top garden and therefore no real decision was taken. The roof top garden would be sufficiently enclosed by walls and therefore children not be affected by cars or pollution. There would be 63.4sqm of roof terrace for the occupants of the flats. The total amenity space was 100sqm.

A resident and objector to the application addressed the Committee and advised that the planning report was not representative and did not consider the valid objections to the planning application. Under this application there was to be no decking removal, no new road serving the entire area and retention of both vehicle and pedestrian underpasses. The Saltram Close playground was not derelict, however it suffered from a maintenance/upgrade issue, continually characterised as derelict. There was no like-for-like provision proposed in an area of increasing amounts of children and anti-social behaviour. Provision would be less than what currently existed. The planning report ignored the pedestrian and vehicle underpass. It was clear that there would be vehicle pressure and additional use of the underpasses by all interested groups. There would be increased parking pressure due to the entrance and exit of the proposed development being directly onto Saltram Close. New residents and visitors would park their cars on Saltram Close and no provision was being made for the occupants of the flats.

A local resident endorsed the statement made by the objector. Planning officers had rejected local resident's concerns in relation to the roof top garden, noise and pollution. The proposed building would be an eyesore for residents and Saltram Close would be overshadowed. There were concerns about parking for new residents of the proposed flat and visitors. The playground was in use despite it's condition.

In response to the Committee's enquiry on whether any form of development should take place on the site the objector responded that Saltram Close would be overshadowed and crowded. The playground has been characterised as derelict and the football surface had come to the end of its life, however children still played on the decking. The square should be retained for the under 5's and a football area.

Cllr Bevan addressed the Committee and stated that the previous

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

application was for a development for the whole estate. This application was for a separate plot of land for a block of flats. There were issues related to the design of the development, tenure mix was not compliant with the Council's policy. Amenity space provided within a tower block with roof garden which was considered to be unacceptable as children could not ride bikes on a roof. The Committee was requested to consider the density in respect of additional housing on an estate which was considered much too high. The design and appearance of the proposed development did not fit into the surrounding location nor enhance or connect with surrounding buildings.

The Committee enquired of Cllr Bevan what involvement he had had in respect of the proposed development and in response were advised that he had attended the public Development Control Forum as part of the consultation.

The applicant responded to the objections raised and stated that he had worked on this development for a number of years with Haringey. The site was small and there was a need to provide four bedroom houses. In respect of Monument Way an acoustic report had already been submitted to address the concerns raised regarding traffic noise. The proposed scheme was virtually the same as the original application in terms of access and included works to the estate.

The Committee raised several issues with the applicant:

1. Why the original scheme which residents were happy with was now being replaced.
2. Materials to be used particularly the white rendering which was considered to get dirty quickly.
3. The design was too intensive.
4. The roof top garden for children to play in near to traffic pollution.
5. The proposed density was considered not appropriate in terms of the surrounding area.

The applicant replied that from their point of view the original scheme was split into three sites:

- Saltram Close
- The playground
- The factory site which was in private ownership

Site 3 they were no longer in discussions with the owner to purchase it.

All the materials proposed were good sustainable finishes and it was considered that all materials collect dirt and would need to be cleaned. A maintenance regime was proposed to deal with these

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

issues. In terms of the side view to Saltram Close the rooms were all non habitable and would include secured glass. The mass of the tower element affected only two windows (bathrooms) and seen as a minimal loss. There were no real issues of loss of light and overlooking. The roof garden was a fairly acceptable way to retain space in terms of the design and landscaping. The tower block would have a lift so access would be much easier. The applicant confirmed that an air pollution test had not been carried out on the site and this should have been done given the level of traffic on Monument Way. The density of the proposed development was at the lower end of density levels.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions and on a vote there being 3 in favour and 6 against the application was refused planning permission.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be refused planning permission on the grounds of design, scale of the proposal on the left hand side and lack of amenity space.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/1106  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 21/07/2008

Location: Playground Site adjoining Stainby Road, Monument Way N15

Proposal: Residential redevelopment of playground site adjoining Stainby Road comprising 15 units: 6 x four bed houses and a block of 9 flats comprising 4 x one bed and 5 x three bed flats (forming part of previously approved scheme, reference HGY/2005/1257).

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Refused

Drawing No's: 262/SR 00-001A, 262/SR 00-002A, 262/SR 00-003B, 262/SR 00-004B, 262/SR 00-005B, 262/SR 00-006B, 262/SR 00-007B, 262/SR 00-008B, 262/SR 00-009B, 262/SR 00-010 & 262/SR 00-011.

Reasons:

1. The proposed development would contain insufficient and unsatisfactory amenity space in relation to the accommodation to be provided and the nature and character of the surrounding area including the Saltram Close Housing Estate situated immediately to the South contrary to Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' of the Haringey unitary Development Plan.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p>2. The height, bulk, mass and design of the proposed block of flats would be out of keeping with and detract from the visual amenities of the locality and would be overbearing in relation to the residential amenities of the adjacent properties to the South on the existing Saltram Close Housing Estate contrary to Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p><b>PC229.</b></p>	<p><b>97~99 PHILIP LANE N15</b></p> <p>The Officer presented the report and informed the Committee that the application proposed 10 flats but in fact there were 12 flats in the scheme, 8 x 1 bed flats and not 6.</p> <p>The application site comprised the front of Nos 97-99 Philip Lane. The building comprised a pair of semi detached dwellings on the end of a group of three similar pairs. These houses formed an important element in the Clyde Circus conservation area.</p> <p>In 2007 planning permission was refused for the redevelopment of this building as 12 self contained flats. The building was currently in a very poor state of repair, following two separate fires. The rear walls were very badly damaged and the roof had been completely destroyed. The design of this scheme was to repair and where necessary, replace the external shell of the building and to match the new elements as closely as possible to the original.</p> <p>In order to allow light to the lower ground floor units, lightwells would be created to the front and rear of the building, the front garden was sufficiently large to accommodate the lightwell without any detriment to the appearance of the conservation area. The rear extension had been reduced in length compared to the refused scheme so that it was approximately 5 metres from the rear boundary. The design and appearance of the proposed extension was to match as closely as possible the materials, finishes and appearance of the original building. The scheme was proposed as a car free development as the site was located in an area of medium public transport accessibility and was within a controlled parking zone.</p> <p>Members raised concern that the proposed application was designated a car free development and it was felt it discriminated against trades people from buying these properties.</p> <p>Members further noted that on the site visit there was an odd shaped garden boundary and requested the garden space be defined. The Committee requested that an extra condition be imposed for landscaping the alleyway.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions and the extra condition to landscape the alleyway. On a vote there being 6 in favour and 2 against the motion was carried. Cllr Dodds requested that his dissent be noted.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions and the extra condition to landscape the alleyway.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/1054  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 21/07/2008

Location: 97 - 99 Philip Lane N15

Proposal: Retention and rebuilding of existing fire damaged building, including two storey extension to rear to provide 8 x 1 bed flats, 2 x 2 bed flats and 2 x 3 bed flats, 12 flats in total.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103 & 2200.

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. 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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

amenity.

4. A scheme for the treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development including the space between the west elevation of the proposed rear extension and the side boundary of the site 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.

5. 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.

6. The existing trees on the site shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise affected in any way (including raising and lowering soil levels under the crown spread of the trees) and no excavation shall be cut under the crown spread of the trees without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the trees in the interest of visual amenity of the area.

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. 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. That not more than 12 separate units, whether flats or houses, shall be constructed on the site.

Reason: In order to avoid overdevelopment of the site.

10. Before any work is undertaken in pursuance of this consent to demolish any part of the building, such steps shall be taken and such works shall be carried out as shall, during the progress of works

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

permitted by this consent, secure the safety and stability of that part of the building which is to be retained.

Reason: In order to ensure that the advertisements do not pose a hazard to blind and partially sighted pedestrians.

11. Demolition work shall be carried out by hand or by tools held in the hand other than power driven tools.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

12. Prior to the commencement of work on site the following information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

a) samples of all proposed external facing materials, including facing brickwork, natural slate roofing and vertically sliding sash timber windows.

b) fully annotated and dimensioned elevation and section drawings showing the repair and re-instatement of all architectural features to the front elevation and side elevations of the building at a scale of 1:20, to include details of roof dormer windows, bracketed projecting eaves, stucco architraves and reveals to windows, brickwork walls, entrance doors and sash windows.

c) fully annotated and dimensioned details of front boundary treatment to Philip Lane, showing low level wall/gates at a scale of 1:10

d) full details of hard and soft landscaping to the front garden.

Reason: to ensure the satisfactory standard of development to preserve the character and appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area.

13. 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.

14. The residential buildings 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'.

15. That all the rear garden area shown within the planning application between the rear of the houses and new rear extension to the rear boundary of the site (as marked in red on site plan accompanying the application for planning permission) shall be retained is garden amenity space for the occupiers of some or all of the flats to be erected in the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p>approved scheme and shall be maintained as such thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory standard of provision of amenity spaces for the future occupiers of the proposed development.</p> <p>16. That details of the proposed arches over the new windows openings in the new extension to match those in the existing houses shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the works. Such agreed details to be implemented as part of the construction of the extension. Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the proposed development in relation to the appearance of the existing buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>17. That the existing trees and shrubs situated along the rear boundary of the site shall be protected during construction and retained thereafter. Reason: In order to protect the visual amenity of the locality.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that only the highest quality yellow stock facing brickwork, in terms of quality of materials, colour, texture, bond, and pointing, for the repair and reinstatement of the front and side elevations to Philip Lane will be acceptable.</p> <p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>The proposal meets the requirements of the relevant policies in the Unitary Development Plan 2006 and is considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area in line with Policy CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes</p>	
<p><b>PC230.</b></p>	<p><b>44~50 COLERIDGE ROAD N8</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the application site was situated on the north side of Coleridge Road within the Crouch End Conservation Area. The Area to the west and south of the property was predominantly residential although immediately adjacent to the town centre to the east.</p> <p>The proposed development had been designed to reflect the existing traditional character and style of the adjoining properties. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in the location and that it would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area. It was further considered there would be no detrimental effect on privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The proposal fell below the threshold for Affordable Housing as it was for only 9 units and provided for 5 car parking spaces. The</p>	



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

vehicle entrance to the parking spaces provided would be via an existing cross-over. A sustainability checklist was completed and included good ventilation, provision for condensing boilers to all units, the use of reclaimed bricks and the use of the existing structure.

The Committee raised questions regarding the refuge facilities and fire access. The planning officer informed the Committee that the Fire Authority were satisfied with the proposal. Members enquired why this application provided parking spaces as opposed to the previous application considered. The transportation officer responded that within the UDP an application must meet the criteria for a car free development the application site must lay within a controlled parking zone. There was no controlled parking zone in Crouch End therefore this application could not be designated car free development.

An objector addressed the Committee and advised that he was representing the views of a number of residents in Coleridge Road. He questioned the accuracy of the plans provided and stated that the proposal was absolutely not in character with the area. The plans provided detailed a 4 storey building with 9 units, the windows were much smaller and out of character. The left hand side of the building housed 5-6 cars so there would be no net gain in terms of parking. With respect to the petrol reservoirs these had only been covered over. There was a drainage issue with respect to overflows and there would be no one responsible to maintain or manage these. The staircase was considered to be too steep as the treads were quite high, very dangerous and a risk to residents.

The planning officer advised the Committee that an informative would be added that redundant crossovers would be removed and there would be a single access to the premises, therefore off street parking would be replaced.

The Committee questioned the objector on how he would like to see the proposal modified and in response was informed that safety was at risk in respect of the narrow staircase. The proposal was out of character for the area and the density was too much on the small site.

The applicant, in response to the objectors concerns, informed the Committee that the layout of the proposal had been consulted on with the responsible authorities. In terms of the original scheme this had been a car park free scheme and negotiations had taken place for the garage unit to be used as car parking space to address some of the issues and appearance of the development. There was no change to the façade, the density conformed with the local area and adjacent development. The ground floor would be a retail property.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

The Committee enquired where the amenity space would be provided and in response was informed that provision would be at first floor level as there would be no ground floor space available. The Committee considered the proposal and requested that an additional condition be added that the ornate window lintels on the development next door be mirrored in the proposed scheme.

The Officer advised that two further informatives would also be added in terms of the crossovers, naming and numbering of the building.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application and on a vote their being 8 in favour, nil against and 1 abstention the application was granted.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions, the additional condition to mirror the window lintels of the neighbouring building, the informatives for crossovers, naming and numbering of the building and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/0736  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 21/07/2008

Location: 44 - 50 Coleridge Road N8

Proposal: Erection of two storey residential building at first floor level over existing single storey commercial premises, and additional storey above existing residential, to provide 9 residential units with 5 parking spaces at ground floor level.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: 08(0097)PL35, 06(0097)31A & 32A.

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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

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. 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.

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.

5. 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.

6. No development shall commence until 2) and 3) below are carried out to the approval of London Borough of Haringey.

1. The Applicant will submit a site-wide energy strategy for the proposed development. This strategy must meet the following criteria:

2. (a) Inclusion of a site-wide energy use assessment showing projected annual demands for thermal (including heating and cooling) and electrical energy, based on contemporaneous building regulations minimum standards. The assessment must show the carbon emissions resulting from the projected energy consumption.

(b) The assessment should demonstrate that the proposed heating and cooling systems have been selected in accordance with the following order of preference: passive design; solar water heating; combined heat and power for heating and cooling, preferably fuelled by renewables; community heating for heating and cooling; heat pumps; gas condensing boilers and gas central heating. The strategy should examine the potential use of CHP

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

to supply thermal and electrical energy to the site. Resulting carbon savings to be calculated.

(c) Inclusion of onsite renewable energy generation to reduce the remaining carbon emissions (i.e. after (a) is accounted for) by 10% subject to feasibility studies carried out to the approval of LB Haringey.

3. All reserved matters applications must contain an energy statement demonstrating consistency with the site wide energy strategy developed in 2). Consistency to be approved by LB Haringey prior to the commencement of development. Reason: To ensure the development incorporates energy efficiency measures including on-site renewable energy generation, in order to contribute to a reduction in Carbon Dioxide Emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

Reason: To ensure the development incorporates energy efficiency measures including on-site renewable energy generation, in order to contribute to a reduction in Carbon Dioxide Emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

7. 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.

8. The development shall provide 9 (nine) cycle racks.

Reason: To encourage sustainable mode of travel.

9. That the brick arch detail above the window openings on the front elevation of the proposed development shall match those of the adjoining houses recently built on the adjacent site to the west.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the proposed building in relation to its neighbours and to maintain the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area.

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.

INFORMATIVE: The proposed development requires a new crossover to be made over the footway and any redundant crossover removed. The necessary works will be carried out by the Council at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 020 8489 1316 to obtain a cost estimate and to arrange for the works to be carried out.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008**

	<p>INFORMATIVE: The new development will require 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>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>The proposal accords with Policies HSG1 'New Housing Developments', UD3 'Quality Design', UD6 'Waste Storage', also Policy UD4 'Quality Design' and Policy M9 'Car Free Development' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and is considered consistent with PPS 3 'Housing' and PPS13 'Transport'. The proposal is in accordance with Supplementary Planning Guidance especially 1a 'Design Guidance', 10c 'Negotiation and Monitoring of Obligations', and 8a 'Waste and Recycling'.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes</p>	
<p><b>PC231.</b></p>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>	
<p><b>PC232.</b></p>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 8 September 2008 at 19:00hrs.</p>	

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK

Chair