

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

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

Also Present: Councillors Allison, Bevan, Gorrie, Stanton and Winskill

\*Denotes Members present

| <b>MINUTE NO.</b> | <b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>   | <b>ACTION BY</b> |
|-------------------|---|------------------|
| PC262.            | <p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>Cllr Dodds, deputy in the chair.</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Peacock for whom Cllr Stanton was substituting. Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Patel.</p>  |                  |
| PC263.            | <p><b>URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>  |                  |
| PC264.            | <p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>   |                  |
| PC265.            | <p><b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b></p> <p>None received.</p>   |                  |
| PC266.            | <p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to agree the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 8 September 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 8 September 2008 be agreed and signed.</p>   |                  |
| PC267.            | <p><b>APPEAL DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the outcome of 30 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during July and August 2008 of which 13 (43%) were allowed and 16 (53%) were dismissed and 1 withdrawn.</p> <p>The Committee was further advised that there was a wide range of types of appeals dealt with in this period, however there were</p> |                  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      | <p>no discernable trends. There were no appeals to draw to the Committee's particular attention as the report covered a wide range from small house hold conversions to change of use.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>PC268.</b></p> | <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 18 August 2008 and 14 September 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>PC269.</b></p> | <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 8 September 2008 Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Officer drew the Committee's attention to page 72 of the agenda. All major applications were determined within 13 weeks, 3 out of 3 cases. Minor applications 83% were determined within 8 weeks, 38 out of 46 cases, 2% below the Haringey target of 85%, however above the government target of 65%. In respect of other application 90% were determined within 8 weeks, which was the Haringey target. Overall the figures for the last 12 months to the end of August were within the government target but slightly below the Haringey target.</p> <p>Members requested whether it was possible to receive a 12 month rolling period of performance statistics in order to give an holistic picture instead of the current 12 month period. The Officer agreed to pass on the request to the appropriate officer who dealt with the statistics.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p> |  |
| <p><b>PC270.</b></p> | <p><b>HOUSING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT</b></p> <p>The Chair asked and it was agreed to vary the agenda to consider item 15 next.</p> <p>Cllr Bevan entered the meeting at 8:15pm.</p>  |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

The Haringey Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF). It would provide guidance on the existing UDP policies and would be a material consideration when considering and determining planning applications. The SPD would replace the existing SPG on housing standards, density, design and affordable housing.

A public consultation took place between 17 April and 29 May 2008 on the Draft Haringey Housing SPD. A total of 14 written responses were received from individuals or organisations. An area of concern was raised by the GLA in relation to affordable housing and the 50:50 tenure split between social rented and intermediate provision as a starting point. The GLA advised that in conformity with the London Plan which stated that boroughs should take account of the London-wide 70:30 housing tenure split in setting targets.

Following the public consultation on the draft Sustainability Appraisal of the Housing SPD, the draft SPD had been amended, where appropriate, to reflect the representations received, including those made by the GLA. The report sought Members' final views on the SPD prior to its adoption as an SPD which would be part of the LDF subject to the agreement of the Cabinet on 14 October 2008.

The Committee was advised that the SPD would be used to provide benefits for the Haringey community in terms of ensuring an adequate standard and range of housing, especially affordable and accessible housing in order to meet current and future needs of the borough.

Cllr Patel entered the meeting at 8:20pm.

Cllr Bevan addressed the meeting to support the Housing SPD and the number of improvements in obtaining mixed sustainable housing and balanced communities. The threshold for affordable housing within the Housing SPD was 10 units, however endeavours had been made to reduce this to 5 units, which was not possible and therefore, an aim for the future. Cllr Bevan expressed his sincere thanks to the officers for their hard work on Housing SPD.

The Committee raised several points in relation to the Housing SPD and enquired:

1. What consultation took place with the wider community and whether any other objections/proposals had been received.
2. What were the implications for large sites like the Haringey

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

Heartlands or Tottenham Hale development in terms of the guidance.

3. Homes in multiply occupation (HMOs) – how would Haringey tighten control and the SPD fit into the work on HMOs.
4. The affordable housing target was set at 680 units per year and a target of 50% for new housing. How would this compare to the actual need in the borough?
5. Would the Housing SPD increase the strength of the Committee in terms of the design of future proposals?
6. On page 190, paragraph 4.7, required that new housing development should take place on previously developed land and new development proposals would make effective use of the land.

In response the Committee was advised:

1. The Council was obliged to consult with stakeholders and the community. The consultation took place in April/May 2008 together with an exhibition. There was also further provision to make comments on-line on the Council's website. At the back of the report (page 151), this detailed all comments/responses received during the consultation and a number were taken on board.
2. All housing development in Haringey Heartlands and Tottenham Hale would comply with the requirements for 50% affordable housing for those sites.
3. The Housing SPD set out the standards of development and how to proceed. Page 202 of the document listed some of the standards sought to be achieved in housing development, however the SPD would feed into how to deal with the problems of HMOs.
4. The 680 units per year was the target for additional homes. The number of units would be dependent on an assessment of local need when the proposal was put forward for consideration.
5. The objective of the Housing SPD was to reinforce the policies in the UDP, the Core Strategy and the support the wider planning objectives to achieve a mix of developments.
6. It was now a requirement that all developments should be on brownfield sites but could also be on green sites where previous development had taken place.

The Committee was asked to note the work, including consultation, carried out on the proposed Haringey Housing Supplementary Planning Document, and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

The Chair moved a motion to agree the recommendations outlined in the report and to echo Cllr Bevan's thanks to the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      | <p>officers for their hard work.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the work, including consultation, carried out on the proposed Haringey Housing Supplementary Planning Document, and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal be noted;</li> <li>2. That the approval be given to the adoption of the Haringey Housing SPD and the accompanying sustainability appraisal, and that Cabinet be recommended to give its approval on the 14 October 2008.</li> <li>3. That officers be thanked for their hard work on the Housing SPD and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.</li> </ol>   |  |
| <p><b>PC271.</b></p> | <p><b>22 AYLMER ROAD N2</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the application site was located on the northern side of Aylmer Road, between the intersections with The Bishops Avenue and Bancroft Avenue respectively, and close to the boundary with the London Borough of Barnet. The site was adjoined by similar large residential properties and most have their own driveways and forecourts. The property was not in a Conservation Area.</p> <p>The subject site was not in an area that had reached its capacity for conversions. Furthermore, the site was not within an identified restricted conversion area. The proposed conversion essentially required only internal refurbishment of the existing property and did not result in more than one flat per floor and would retain one family unit with the three bedroom flat, therefore no loss of family accommodation. The site was located within adequate proximity to public transport options and a number of non-residential facilities, including shops.</p> <p>The development essentially involved internal building works, modifications only and no proposed changes to the external elevation of the property. Alteration works were proposed to the side walkway along the eastern boundary of the site adjoining the property at No. 24 Aylmer Road. These works were considered to be an improvement on the existing inconsistent building approach on the site. The applicant had advised that the external construction materials were to match those of the existing property. The proposal was considered to be acceptable in relation to design and scale. The property had a long rear garden. The plans detailed two vehicle accesses, space for three car parking bays and this was considered more than the minimum requirement for two flats.</p> <p>An local resident addressed the Committee and objected to the proposal because it did not meet the requirements of the UDP.</p> |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

The forecourt could accommodate three cars, however if cars were to enter and leave in forward gear this would mean that it would only be feasible to park two cars therefore, creating parking pressure which would be intolerable for neighbours. The bay windows adjacent to the garden would create overlooking and neighbours would lose amenity. The property was not suitable for a house conversion and not commensurate with the character of Alymer Road and there was no need for flats. No other house in Alymer Road had been converted.

The location was not suitable as there was poor public transport and no nearby shops. The plans were riddled with errors as the kitchen vent could not be sited as shown on the application because there was a skylight in the roof. Three trees were also omitted from the plans. Two hundred local residents had objected to the proposals by letter, email and petition.

Cllr Gorrie addressed the Committee and expressed his concern regarding the proposed parking layout at the site. He felt that this application would set a precedence for the rest of the street. There was a 50 mile per hour speed limit along the road and therefore it was considered not to be safe to manoeuvre and exit from the premises. The roof would be turned into a terrace causing overlooking. The proposed materials were not commensurate with the rest of the property and no details were given in the conditions.

The applicant addressed the Committee and advised that the planning officers had inspected the premises. There would only be external alterations to the single storey walkway which was considered to improve the property for two self contained flats. The proposal complied with all the guidelines and it was not within a restricted conversion area. The Committee had heard concerns about precedence being established, however all applications were considered on their own merits.

The applicant further advised that the application premises had a floor area of 273sqm, therefore this complied with the floor area requirements. The layout design would enable the premises to be reverted back to a single family dwelling. In terms of entry to the flats both would be accessed through the front door. The flat roof could not be used as a terrace, however this could be conditioned. Transport for London raised no objections to the previous application for four units. There was a 40 mile per hour limit on Alymer Road and not as previously stated as 50 miles per hour.

The Committee enquired whether the upstairs flat would have access to the garden and in response the applicant confirmed that the plans did not specify that the garden would be for communal use. It would be possible for the occupants of the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

three bed flat to access the garden and this could also be conditioned.

The Committee then viewed the plans.

Members queried the size of the conversion and whether indeed the balcony would cause overlooking. The applicant replied that the size of the conversion was well above the minimum guidelines for a conversion. The aim of the proposal was not to over sub divide the property. A previous scheme had been for four flats and this was considered to be excessive. It was the view that two flats would be comfortable on size and location. In respect of the doors they did exist and Members could condition that they be converted to a Juliet balcony if it was felt to be essential.

The Committee requested the following additional conditions and informatives be included.

1. A condition to approve the location of refuse bins.
2. A modification to condition 4 regarding the safety feature that the doors open inward.
3. An informative that both flats have access to the rear garden.
4. That the trees at the front of the premises be retained.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions and the additional two conditions and two informatives above. On a vote there being 8 in favour and 1 against the application was granted.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions and the additional conditions and informatives.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/1152  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/10/2008

Location: 22 Aylmer Road N2

Proposal: Conversion of property from single occupancy house to 1 x three bed flat and 1 x one bed flat.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions

Decision: Grant subject to conditions

Drawing No's: 201 REV 01, 202, 203, 204 REV 01, 205 REV 01, 206 REV 01 & 207 REV 02.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

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. That not more than two flats shall be established on the site.

Reason: In order to avoid overdevelopment of the site.

4. The roof of the rear ground floor projection shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area without the benefit of the grant of further specific permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority. Further, a safety railing shall be erected on the exterior of the French doors to the bay window on the rear elevation at first floor level (serving the proposed living / dining area). Details of such railings are to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the premises.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties are not prejudiced by overlooking.

5. Details of the design, materials and location of enclosures or structures to house waste and recycling containers shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development; such structures shall be installed before occupation of either of the flats.

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

INFORMATIVE: You are requested to ensure that, following the implementation of this permission (A) both flats have access to the rear garden area, and (B) the existing trees within the front boundary wall of the site, to Aylmer Road, shall, as far as possible, be retained.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposed conversion will provide adequate levels of residential amenity for future residents without unreasonably impacting on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Further, the amended proposal facilitates a modest and satisfactory increase in the intensity of the residential use on the site and is consistent with Council's Conversion Policy. As such, the proposed development is considered to be in



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      | <p>keeping with Policies G2 'Development and Urban Design', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix' and M10 'Parking for Development' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes' and SPG3b 'Privacy / Overlooking, Aspect / Outlook, Daylight / Sunlight'.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>  |  |
| <p><b>PC272.</b></p> | <p><b>REAR OF 60-80 CECILE PARK N8</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the application site comprised a lock up garage court between Cecile Park and Haringey Park. The site was a long, narrow rectangle surrounded on all sides by the rear gardens of the neighbouring residential properties. Access is from Gladwell Road which is a steep sloping residential street. The site was located within the Crouch End Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site had been subject to a number of planning applications for change of use to residential in recent years. In 2006 a public enquiry was held to consider six separate applications having been made between 2001 and 2006. Two of those appeals were withdrawn and the remaining four were dismissed.</p> <p>In support of their application, the applicant had amended the scheme in relation to the Inspector's comments and submitted a planning statement, design and access statement, sustainability checklist, structural survey, highways statement, tree condition survey, bat and other protected species survey. The number of units had been reduced from four to two and from 2-storey to single storey along with the removal of the new garages proposed as part of the previous schemes. The proposed houses would not be substantially higher than the existing garage buildings and would not interfere with the views across the site from the surrounding properties.</p> <p>The Transportation Group considered that the development would not generate sufficient traffic to prevent sharing the access between pedestrians and vehicles. They had however, recommended traffic calming measures at the access point via a Section 278 agreement.</p> <p>The Council, in order to address the issues raised regarding the loss of the garages, carried out its own surveys into parking demand and demand for lock up garages in the local area. The results demonstrated that there were more vehicles parked in the survey area than there were spaces available, the results clearly</p> |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

indicated that severe parking pressures did exist in the area surrounding the application site. The second survey demonstrated that there was demand for lock up garages in the area. If garages were available then the majority of local people would wish to rent or buy one.

An Arboricultural method statement had been supplied giving details of the method of construction in terms of the tree roots, particularly in relation to the foundations. Eight trees highlighted would be removed for reasons of sound arboricultural management, the applicant had stated with the exception of these trees, there was no other intention to remove any other trees. The large Horse Chestnut tree which was protected by a Tree Preservation Order was to be retained.

It was considered that the current scheme conflicted with the aims of policy UD3(c) of the Unitary Development Plan 2006, which stated that development should not significantly affect the public and private transport networks, including highways or traffic conditions. In addition the proposal was considered to result in a detrimental effect on the conservation area as a result of additional on-street parking. The scheme was considered to fail to meet the requirements of PPG15 and policy CSV1 of the UDP and was therefore recommended for refusal.

Members enquired how many garages were in use and in reply was informed that one garage was used for car parking and a small number used for storage.

An objector addressed the Committee and stated that after nine schemes and 10 years later the issues by the inspector were significant and all pertinent. There was excessive car parking pressure in the area that could be reduced by the proper use of the garages. These had been allowed to run down by the applicant. The surveys clearly showed the demand for the garages and the parking pressure.

A local resident also addressed the Committee and was grateful to the Council for arranging the surveys and agreed with the recommendations in the report. The main objections to the application were:

1. Intrusion.
2. Access, refuge and recycling collections.
3. The height and proximity to the boundaries. The new buildings would still be intrusive as they would cover most of the site.

Members queried the access arrangements and the officers explained that the applicant had reverted to unsatisfactory arrangements for refuse collection. It was a problem which the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

developer could not resolve.

The applicant addressed the Committee and informed that the scheme presented overcame the issues raised by the inspector, conservation officer, tree officer, highways department and also the reduction in the number of units.

The report indicated the limited use of the existing garages which would have to be demolished and rebuilt as asbestos would need to be removed. If the garages were in use there would be lights, noise, more traffic and more unsafe for pedestrians. There would be greater intrusion if the garages were in full use. The area would further be opened to crime.

The proposal was for two family units of accommodation, the height of the scheme was considerably lower than in previously applications. The refuse area had been designed for the two houses and on the day of collection, bins would be taken to the entrance of the site and returned by the occupants.

Cllr Allison entered the meeting at 8:45pm.

The Committee referred to the garages not being in a usable condition and enquired when they were last marketed. The applicant advised the garages had been available for letting and that fifty local residents had made enquiries about renting them. Two local estate agents had advised they would not let them as they were considered to be dangerous.

The Chair moved a motion to refuse the application and on a vote there was a unanimous decision to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED**

That the application for planning permission be refused on the grounds:

1. The of loss of parking facilities in a congested area which would result in the increased demand for on-street parking.
2. Prejudiced traffic and conditions of general safety along neighbouring highways as contrary to Policy UD3(c).
3. Adversely affect the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2007/1866  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/10/2008

Location: Rear Of 60 - 88 Cecile Park N8

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      | <p>Proposal: Demolition of existing garages and erection of 2 x single storey houses with associated car parking.</p> <p>Recommendation: Refused</p> <p>Decision: Refused</p> <p>Drawing No's: PP-01 to PP-07, PP-10 to PP24 incl.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>1. The loss of the lock up garages would result in the loss of valuable parking facilities in a congested area which would result in increased demand for on-street parking thereby,</p> <p>i) prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway as a contrary to Policy UD3(c) 'General Principles', and</p> <p>ii) adversely affect the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area contrary to Policy CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p> |  |
| <p><b>PC273.</b></p> | <p><b>REAR OF 60-88 CECILE PARK N8 ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing garages and erection of 2 x single storey houses with associated car parking.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>The Committee agreed to refuse Conservation Area Consent as planning permission for the application outlined in PC272 above was refused.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2007/1867 FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/10/2008</p> <p>Location: Rear Of 60 - 88 Cecile Park N8</p> <p>Proposal: Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing garages and erection of 2 x single storey houses with associated car parking.</p> <p>Recommendation: Refuse Consent</p> <p>Decision: Refuse Consent</p>                                 |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
|                      | <p>Drawing No's: PP-01 to PP-07, PP-10 to PP24 incl.</p> <p>Reason:</p> <p>1. The proposed demolition of the garages would be premature in that the Local Planning Authority has not received an application and / or granted planning permission for a suitable replacement development. Premature demolition would not be in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the Scotland Green Conservation Area contrary to Policy CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>  |  |
| <p><b>PC274.</b></p> | <p><b>158 TOTTENHAM LANE N8</b></p> <p>The Officer presented the report and advised the Committee that at page 116 there was an error by the Transportation Group that referred to business use which was not in the application. A further error was highlighted in term of a reference to an underground car park which should have read undercroft also not in this application.</p> <p>The application site was currently vacant and situated on the northern side of Tottenham Lane adjoining the existing Texaco petrol filling station. The site was directly opposite the roundabout that intersected Ferme Park Road and Tottenham Lane. To the north was Rokesly Infants and Junior Schools. The current proposal sought outline consent for the erection of 9 x 3 storey, four bedroom townhouses with associated parking and access.</p> <p>An appeal decision concerning the Texaco petrol filling station and the current application site which was dismissed was a material consideration and acted as a benchmark which further application were assessed. The inspector identified the main issues as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The design of the proposal and its visual impact within the street scene, including longer views.</li> <li>2. The effect upon the amenity of the users of adjoining Rokesly School in terms of overlooking and overshadowing of the school playground.</li> </ol> <p>The dwellings were considered to be of an acceptable standard in terms of layout and room size, the overall dwelling being above the Council's minimum space standard. It was considered that the design approach was modern and could fit in with the surrounding area. The proposed schemed had a density of 305hrh, which was in line with the London Plan.</p> |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

The scale and height of the proposal was consistent along its length and considered that the proposed development would not exceed the existing height of neighbouring residential buildings and it would not have a significant overbearing affect on neighbouring properties. Given the proposed use, adjoining residential properties and proximity to public transport options, the principle of residential use on the site was considered appropriate.

The BRE study found that the School buildings and playgrounds would not suffer a significant loss of daylight. It was considered that the change in circumstance by the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm in terms of overlooking of the school playground. The report also concluded that the development would result in a greater degree of overshadowing than currently existed but for most of the year the playground would be mostly unaffected.

Car parking for the scheme would be provided at the front of the site with direct access from Tottenham Lane. The Transportation Group was satisfied with the access and levels of parking proposed.

The Chair of Governors at Rokesly Junior School addressed the Committee to object that no consultation had taken place with the school and requested that the decision on the application be deferred. The school objected to the intrusion of overlooking of the playground used by pupils for physical education throughout the day. The proposal included balconies and a roof dais which had no purpose as the proposal would have gardens. There would be overshadowing as the development would take away some light from the playground, particularly in the winter months.

Cllr Gorrie addressed the Committee and stated that page 114 of the report referred to the pre-application history. There was no reference to other planning applications. This application was for 9 units and therefore below the affordable housing threshold. The head teacher of Rokesly School was only made aware of the application in the previous week and it was considered that a serious mistake would have been made were the application granted without consultation of a significant neighbour. The application was lodged during the school summer holiday.

Cllr Winskill entered the meeting at 9:05pm.

The Committee was requested to defer the application pending a detailed consultation with the applicant and the School.

The applicant in response addressed the Committee and confirmed that the application was for 9 family houses. There had

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |   |  |
|----------------------|---|--|
|                      | <p>previously been a number of applications submitted, however this application sought to address the previous planning issues and was in accordance with the UDP and Housing SPD. Access to the proposed development had been agreed with the Highways department. The current proposed development was one and a half storeys lower than the appeal scheme. The applicant further agreed to accept a condition to heighten the boundary and place a screen on the balconies in order to remove access. There was confusion why the school was not aware of the application as this had been published in the Hornsey Journal on 18 September 2008.</p> <p>The Committee enquired of the applicant whether they were agreeable to Juliette balconies and in response the applicant stated he would be happy to accept that condition.</p> <p>The Committee then viewed the plans.</p> <p>Members enquired when the consultation had taken place and whether this was during the school summer holiday. The Officer responded that a list of two hundred people were consulted and letters were sent out in accordance with the consultation procedures. Planning applications were submitted at all times of the year. There had been time for the school to have responded to the consultation up until the Committee meeting. The Committee was reminded that this application was for outline permission and that some of the details of the application would come before the Committee again, however others would be dealt with under delegated powers. It was also possible that no details would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee.</p> <p>Cllr Weber moved a motion to delay the decision on the application pending a consultation with the school. Cllr Wilson seconded the motion.</p> <p>The Chair moved to a vote to defer consideration of the application. There being five in favour and four against, the decision to defer the application was deferred.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the application be deferred pending a consultation with the school.</p> |  |
| <p><b>PC275.</b></p> | <p><b>2-6 MIDDLE LANE N8</b></p> <p>The Committee was advised that this application site was a four storey building which was part of Crouch End Town Centre and was also within the Crouch End Conservation Area. Currently the building was vacant but had previously been used as B1 offices on the ground and upper floors for a number of years. The</p>   |  |

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

proposed refurbishment retained the employment use at ground and converted the upper level office space to residential apartments.

It was considered that the proposed development was of a type and scale which was appropriate for this location. The mixed use scheme met with the relevant policy requirements for sites of this type as well as being in step with the London Plan. The proposed development was below the affordable housing threshold provision.

It was further considered that neighbouring occupiers would not suffer detrimental loss of amenity as a result of adverse additional overlooking and loss of privacy. The current proposal retained the bulk, scale and massing of the existing building. The re-design of the facades was attractive and considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the locality. The scheme included one wheelchair accessible unit and that all the dwellings met the Council's standards in terms of layout and room size.

The officer explained that within the report (pages 132 and 137) the scheme proposed 6 off-street car parking spaces, however the plans detailed 5 car parking spaces and the Committee was asked to make a decision on the number of car parking spaces to be provided. A number of cycle racks would also be included within the cartilage of the development.

Members enquired whether it was possible to condition that one car parking space be made available for the office during business hours. The Committee agreed that 5 car parking spaces would be provided.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application subject to conditions and the extra condition and subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions and the extra condition that one car parking space be made available for the office during business hours, that 5 car parking spaces be provided for the whole scheme and to a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2008/1692  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/10/2008

Location: 2-6 Middle Lane N8



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

Proposal: Refurbishment of existing building with reconstruction of new facade to the elevations, and change of use from offices to offices / 9 residential units comprising 2 x one bed , 5 x two bed and 2 x three bed flats.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: KP-ML-PL01; KP-ML-GA01, 02, 03, 04, 05; KP-ML-ELEV01, 02, 03; KP-ML-SEC01 & 02.

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 in conjunction with the proposed development for all the external surfaces of buildings hereby approved, areas of hard landscaping and boundary walls 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. 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.

5. 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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

Authority.

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

6. Hard and Soft Landscaping details also surface water drainage works along with source control measures shall be carried out in accordance with details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before development commences.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

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. 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 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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

contribute to a reduction in Carbon Dioxide Emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

9. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage 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.

10. That 1 car parking space at the rear of the property shall be allocated for use solely in connection with the ground floor office during normal business hours between 0800 - 1800 on every day of the week except Sundays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the safety and free flow of traffic at the neighbouring property.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that in the interests of the security of the development hereby authorised that all works should comply with BS 8220 (1986), Part 1 - 'Security Of Residential Buildings'.

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: - In regards to surface water drainage Thames Water point out that it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding. Thames Water recognises the environmental and economic benefits of surface water source control and encourages its appropriate application where it is to the overall benefit of our customers. Hence, in the disposal of surface water, Thames Water will recommend that the Applicant:

- a) Looks to ensure that new connections to the public sewerage system do not pose an unacceptable threat of surcharge, flooding or pollution;
- b) check the proposals are in line with advice from the DETR which encourages, wherever practicable, disposal on site without recourse to the public sewerage system - for example in the form of soakaways or infiltration areas on free draining soils, and
- c) looks to ensure the separation of foul and surface water sewerage on all new developments.

INFORMATIVE: The implementation of a suitable soundproofing scheme is now required as part of the Building Regulations 1991 - Part E. The applicant is now therefore required to formally consult the Councils Building Control Division, 639 High Road, N17 8BD (tel. 020 8489 5504).

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 6 OCTOBER 2008**

|                      |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
|                      | <p><b>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</b></p> <p>The proposed development for complies with Policies, CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', CSV5 'Alterations In Conservation Areas', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage', UD8 'Planning Obligations', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG2 'Change of Use to Residential', HSG9 'Density Standards', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix', M10 'Parking for Development' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes', SPG3b 'Privacy / Overlooking, Aspect / Outlook, Daylight / Sunlight', SPG7a 'Parking Standards', SPG8a 'Waste and Recycling', SPG10a 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations', SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development' and SPG10e 'Improvements to Public Transport Infrastructure and Services'.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes.</p> |  |
| <p><b>PC276.</b></p> | <p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>PC277.</b></p> | <p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 10 November 2009.</p> <p>The meeting concluded at 21:45hrs.</p>   |  |

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK  
Chair