Haringey Council

## Planning Committee

MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 2011 at 19:00 HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Peacock (Chair), McNamara (Vice-Chair), Christophides, Waters, Beacham, Reece, Reid, Schmitz and Rice

This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be filmed. The Council may use the images and sound recording for internal training purposes.

Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for web-casting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the Principal Support Officer (Committee Clerk) at the meeting.

## AGENDA

## 1. APOLOGIES

## 2. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 12 below.

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a personal interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered must disclose to that meeting the existence and nature of that interest at the commencement of that consideration, or when the interest becomes apparent.

A member with a personal interest in a matter also has a prejudicial interest in that matter if the interest is one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the member's judgment of the public interest and if this interest affects their financial position or the financial position of a person or body as described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct and/or if it relates to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to them or any person or body described in paragraph 8 of the Code of Conduct.

## 4. DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS

To consider receiving deputations and/or petitions in accordance with Part Four, Section B, Paragraph 29 of the Council's Constitution.
5. MINUTES (PAGES 1-8)

To confirm and sign the Minutes of the Planning Committee held on 14 February 2011.
6. APPEAL DECISIONS (PAGES 9-12)

To advise the Committee on Appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during January 2011.

## 7. DELEGATED DECISIONS (PAGES 13-34)

To inform the Committee of decisions made under delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the above Committee between 24 January 2011 and 20 February 2011.

## 8. PERFORMANCE STATISTICS (PAGES 35-54)

To advise the Committee of performance statistics on Development Management, Building Control and Planning Enforcement since the 14 February 2011 Committee meeting.
9. TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS (PAGES 55-60)

To confirm the following Tree Preservation Order:

1. 29 Mount Pleasant Villas, N4
2. PLANNING APPLICATIONS (PAGES 61-62)

In accordance with the Committee's protocol for hearing representations; when the recommendation is to grant planning permission, two objectors may be given up to 6 minutes (divided between them) to make representations. Where the recommendation is to refuse planning permission, the applicant and supporters will be allowed to address the Committee. For items considered previously by the Committee and deferred, where the recommendation is to grant permission, one objector may be given up to 3 minutes to make representations.
11. MIMOSA COURT, 27-31 AVENUE ROAD, N15 (PAGES 63-74)

Extension of time limit for implementation of planning permission HGY/2004/0585 for infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, an extension at third floor level to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat, $4 \times 1$ bed flats and the merging of an existing 1 bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, creation of lift and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors.
RECOMMENDATION: Grant permission subject to conditions.
12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 2 above.

## 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday, 11 April 2011, at 7pm.

Please note that the meeting will be followed by a Member Training and Information session on the following topics:

## Update on Planning Policy -

- Proposed changes to planning framework at national level
- Community Infrastructure Levy
- Building Control - what is it?

Ken Pryor
Deputy Head of Local Democracy \& Member Services, $5^{\text {th }}$ Floor
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Helen Chapman
Principal Committee Coordinator
(Non Cabinet Committees)
Tel No: 02084892615
Fax No: 02084892660
Email: helen.chapman@haringey.gov.uk
04 March 2011 MONDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2011

Councillors: Peacock (Chair), McNamara (Vice-Chair), Christophides, Waters, Beacham, Reece, Reid, Wilson and Adamou

Also Councillor Meehan
Present:

| MINUTE | SUBJECT/DECISION | ACTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NO. |  | BY |


| PC141. | APOLOGIES <br> Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Rice, for whom CIIr <br> Adamou was substituting, and from Cllr Schmitz, for whom Cllr <br> Wilson was substituting. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PC142. | URGENT BUSINESS <br> There were no new items of urgent business. An addendum <br> report in respect of agenda item 10 had been tabled, and would <br> be addressed by the officer as part of the presentation of that <br> item. |  |
| PC143. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST <br> Cllr Waters declared a personal interest as she was Ward <br> Councillor for the application at agenda item 13. |  |
| PC144. | DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS <br> There were no deputations or petitions. |  |
| PC145. | MINUTES <br> RESOLVED <br> That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11 January <br> $2011 ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ s p e c i a l ~ P l a n n i n g ~ C o m m i t t e e ~ h e l d ~ o n ~ 24 ~ J a n u a r y ~$ <br> 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair. |  |
| PC146. | APPEAL DECISIONS <br> The Committee considered a report on appeal decisions <br> determined by the Department for Communities and Local <br> Government during December 2010. <br> NOTED | DELEGATED DECISIONS <br> The Committee considered a report on decisions made under |
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|  | delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the Planning Committee between 13 December 2010 and 23 January 2011. <br> In response to a question regarding the property at 146 Wightman Road, it was agreed that the Head of Development Management would write to Cllr Adamou regarding this case. It was also agreed that a briefing note would be provided for the Committee on the process in respect of certificates of lawfulness for HMOs. <br> NOTED |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC148. | PERFORMANCE STATISTICS <br> The Committee considered a report on performance statistics for Development Management, Building Control and Planning Enforcement since the $11^{\text {th }}$ January 2011 Planning Committee. <br> It was noted that the figures in respect of appeals for December 2010 should be corrected to read: <br> " $29 \%$ of appeals allowed on refusals (2 out of 7 cases) $71 \%$ of appeals dismissed on refusals (5 out of 7 cases" <br> The Chair asked for clarification regarding the successful prosecutions referred to Crown Court for confiscation, and it was agreed that the Team Leader, Planning Enforcement, would circulate information on this to the Committee outside the meeting. <br> NOTED |
| PC149. | TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS <br> The Committee considered a report recommending Tree Preservation Orders against trees located at 6 North Hill, N6 and 29 Cranley Gardens, N10. No objections had been received in respect of the proposed TPOs. <br> RESOLVED <br> That the Tree Preservation Orders at 6 North Hill, N6 and 29 Cranley Gardens, N10 be confirmed. |
| PC150. | PLAYGROUND SITE ADJOINING STAINBY ROAD, N15 4EA <br> The Committee considered a report on a proposal to amend the resolution made at the Planning Committee meeting on 11 January 2011 in respect of the Playground Site adjoining Stainby Road to ensure the provision of the housing estate and playground and estate improvements. |
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|  | RESOLVED <br> That the variation of the existing Section 106 Agreement be approved to allow for the playground to be delivered by no later than 31 December 2012 by the Council. <br> The Committee considered an addendum to the report, seeking approval to extend the date for completion of the Section 106 Agreement from 27 January 2011 to 24 March 2011. <br> RESOLVED <br> i) That the Agreement referred to in the Committee's resolution from 11 January is to be completed by no later than 24 March 2011 or within such extended time as the Council's Assistant Director (Planning, Regeneration and Economy) shall in his discretion allow. <br> ii) That in the absence of the Agreement, planning application reference HGY/2010/2025 be refused for the following reasons: <br> In the absence of a formal undertaking to secure a Section 106 Agreement for appropriate contribution towards education provision the proposal is contrary to Policy UD8 'Planning Obligations' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and SPG10c 'Education needs generated by new housing'. |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC151. | 120-128 MAYES ROAD, N22 6SY <br> The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out the application, planning history, consultation and relevant planning policy and factors. The Planning Officer presented the report, highlighting key issues, and the Committee had an opportunity to examine the plans. <br> In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the Council had no control over whether residents of designated 'car-free' developments owned vehicles which they kept elsewhere, but that the restriction on parking in the vicinity of such developments was generally successful. The Committee raised the issue of landscaping, and it was confirmed that a condition would be in place requiring the applicant to submit their plans in respect of landscaping. <br> RESOLVED |
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1) That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2010/2083, subject to a precondition that the owners of the application site shall first have entered into an Agreement or Agreements with the Council under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended) and Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 in order to secure:
1.1) A contribution of $£ 20,000.00$ towards educational facilities within the Borough ( $£ 10,000.00$ for primary and $£ 10,000.00$ for secondary) according to the formula set out in Policy UD8 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 10c of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan July 2006;
1.2) A sum of $£ 1,000.00$ towards the amendment of the relevant Traffic Management Order(s) (TMO) controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the site to reflect that the residential units shall be designated 'car free' and therefore no residents therein will be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit under the terms of this Traffic Management Order(s) (TMO);
1.3) The developer to pay an administration / monitoring cost of $£ 1,000.00$ in connection with this Section 106 agreement. This gives a total of $£ 22,000.00$.
2) That in the absence of the Agreement referred to in the resolution above being completed by $31^{\text {st }}$ March 2011, planning application reference number HGY/2010/2083 be refused for the following reason:

In the absence of a formal undertaking to secure a Section 106 Agreement for appropriate contribution towards education the proposal is contrary to Policy UD8 'Planning Obligations' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10a 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' and SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development'.
3) In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reason set out above, the Assistant Director (PEPP) (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
i) there has not been any material change in
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|  | circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and <br> ii) the further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director (PEPP) within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and <br> iii) the relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution 1) above to secure the obligations specified therein. <br> 4) That following completion of the Agreement referred to in 1) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2010/2083 and the Applicant's drawing No.(s) SLP-100; EX-01, 02; PL-100C \& 101A and subject to the following conditions: <br> Conditions: <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity. <br> 3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the new front boundary treatment, including landscaping, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with such approved detail and prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby approved. <br> Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area. <br> INFORMATIVE: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six |
| :---: | :---: |
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|  | weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 0208489 5573). <br> REASONS FOR APPROVAL <br> Whilst the proposed scheme will involve the loss of a commercial space suitable for employment use which has been actively marketed for a period of over two years, the proposed conversion of this space to residential use is compatible with the use within the rest of the building and surrounding area. The associated changes to the design and layout of the building are considered sensitive to its surrounding and the character of the area and overall the proposal will provide adequate living accommodation. <br> As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies: G2 'Development and Urban Design', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', HSG1 'New Housing Development', HSG9 'Density Standards', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and with supplementary planning guidance SPG1a 'Design Guidance and Design Statements', and the Council's 'Housing' Supplementary Planning Document (2008). <br> Section 106: Yes |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC152. | REAR OF 108-126 STATION ROAD, N22 7SX <br> The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out the application, site and surroundings, planning history, consultation and relevant planning policy and factors. Key issues were highlighted in the Planning Officer's report, and the officer responded to questions from the Committee regarding fire safety, emergency access and current use of the site. It was confirmed that the height of the elevated section of the roof of the proposed development would be 3.7 m at its highest point. <br> Two local residents addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The local residents stated that the proposed house would be very close to the boundaries of a number of properties, and would lead to disturbance to neighbours, particularly when using their gardens, or when they wished to open their windows. It was also reported that the long access drive to the property would increase the risk of crime, as it would offer access to the neighbouring back gardens. Concerns were raised in respect of privacy, overlooking, light pollution, fire risk and emergency access. Residents reported that the existing plot provided a green space linking the gardens of the neighbouring terraces / gardens and contributed to the character of the Conservation Area. The residents concluded that the proposal went against existing Council policy and that, on the basis of the serious concerns they had raised, the application should be rejected. |
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Cllr Meehan, local Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Cllr Meehan stated that he concurred with the views expressed by the local residents and in addition felt that it was a misrepresentation to state that the house would barely be visible above neighbouring fences, when in places it would be significantly higher. Cllr Meehan felt that the location was inappropriate for such a development, and would set a precedent if permitted. The Committee was asked to refuse the application on the grounds that it was inappropriate for this site.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and advised that this was a truly sustainable proposal for a family home on an unused site. It was reported that there was a need for housing in the borough, and that when a family was living on the site, it would in fact improve the security of neighbouring properties. It was reported that this was an application for a well-designed garden house in a garden location, as the proposal was inwardfacing around a courtyard and represented how houses should be built in the future.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant's agent reported that, in his opinion, the proposal would have no detrimental impact on the conservation area, as it would be virtually invisible; the proposal would not have a negative impact on the amenity of any neighbouring properties as the house would result in no greater overlooking than at present and would not affect the light to neighbouring properties. It was reported that the design was as sensitive as possible and that, although the structure would be visible over neighbouring fences, it would be constructed of a similar material so as to be less obtrusive. In respect of concerns raised regarding access to the property for maintenance purposes, the applicant's agent advised that the building would require very little in the way of maintenance. The applicant's agent confirmed that at its highest, the property would be $1.5-2 \mathrm{~m}$ higher than the neighbouring fencing, however this would be in the centre of the roof and not adjacent to any boundary.

The Committee viewed the plans and had a further opportunity to ask questions of officers. The Committee expressed concern regarding the bulk and mass of the proposal, and that the house would loom over neighbouring gardens due to its proximity to the boundaries of other properties, resulting in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. The Committee also noted that, due to the lack of space around the proposed structure, there would be no opportunity for mitigating the building's impact by means of landscaping.

## RESOLVED
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|  | That Planning Application HGY/2010/1614 be refused. <br> Reason: <br> 1. The proposed development by reason of its height, siting, <br> footprint and excessive coverage of this small backland site would <br> represent a cramped form of development which would have an <br> unsympathetic relationship with adjoining properties and would <br> adversely affect the residential and visual amenities of adjoining <br> residents. Furthermore the introduction of such a development on <br> this backland site would fail to preserve or enhance the character <br> and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. As such <br> the proposed development is considered to be contrary to <br> Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design' and CSV1 <br> 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the adopted Haringey <br> Unitary Development Plan and supplementary planning guidance <br> SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG2 'Conservation and Archaeology' <br> and SPG3c 'Backlands Development' and the Council's 'Housing' <br> Supplementary Planning Document 2008. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PC153. | Section 106: No <br> NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS <br> There were no new items of urgent business. |  |
| PC154. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING <br> Monday, 14 March 2011, 7pm. |  |
| The meeting closed at 8.30pm. |  |  |

## COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK

Chair

| Report Title: Appeal decisions determined during January 2011 |
| :--- |
| Report of: Niall Bolger Director of Urban Environment |


| Wards(s) affected: All | Report for: Planning Committee |
| :--- | :--- |

## 1. Purpose

To advise the Committee of appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Govemment during January 2011.

## 2. Summary

Reports outcome of 4 planning appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Govemment during January 2011 of which $0(0 \%)$ were allowed and 4 (100\%) were dismissed.
3. Recommendations

That the report be noted.
Report Authorised by: $\qquad$
$\square \mathrm{O}$

Marc Dorfman Assistant Director Planning \& Regeneration

Contact Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy
Development Management Support Team Leader
Tel: 02084895114

## 4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Planning staff and application case files are located at 639 High Road, London N17 8BD. Applications can be inspected at those offices 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment. In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.
The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5508, 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday.
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## APPEAL DECISION JANUARY 2011

| Ward: | Alexandra |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference Number: | HGY/2009/1993 \& 1994 |
| Decision Level: | Delegated |

## 1 Parham Way N10 2AT

## Proposal:

Appeal A -
Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing bungalow and garages and the erection of a part 2 , part 3 storey development providing 3 no. four bed houses and 1 no. three bed house and associated works

## Appeal B-

Demolition of the existing bungalow and garages and the erection of a part 2, part 3 storey development providing 3 no. four bed houses and 1 no. three bed house and associated works

## Type of Appeal:

Informal Hearing

## Issues;

Appeal B - The effect on the living conditions of neighbours in terms of privacy and out look
Both Appeals - The effects on the character and appearance of the area which forms part of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area

Appeal A - the effect in the absence of an acceptable scheme of redevelopment

## Result:

Both Appeals - Dismissed 28 January 2011
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| Ward: | Bounds Green |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference Number: | HGY/2010/0231 |
| Decision Level: | Delegated |

## 90 Myddleton Road N22 8NQ

## Proposal:

Construction of ground floor rear extension to form a new flat and including the demolition of a part of the existing rear wall

## Type of Appeal:

Written Representation

## Issues;

The effect on the proposal on the living condition of the occupiers no no. 92 Myddleton road
The effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the local shopping centre

## Result:

Appeal - Dismissed 18 January 2011

| Ward: | Highgate |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference Number: | HGY/2010/0151 |
| Decision Level: | Delegated |

## 1D Cromwell Avenue N6 5HN

## Proposal:

Conversion of the property into three self contained studio flats

## Type of Appeal:

Written Representation

## Issues;

Whether the proposal is consistent with locally adopted housing conversion policy and provides for adequate and satisfactory living conditions for future occupants

Result:
Appeal Dismissed 24 January 2011

Agenda item:


Planning Committee
On $14^{\text {th }}$ March 2011

| Report Title: Decisions made under delegated powers between 24 January 2011 <br> and 20 February 2011 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Report of: Niall Bolger Director of Urban Environment |  |
| Wards(s) affected: All | Report for: Planning Committee |

## 1. Purpose

To inform the Committee of decisions made under delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the above Committee.

## 2. Summary

The applications listed were determined between 24 January 2011 and 20 February 2011.
3. Recommendations See following reports.

Report Authorised by: $\qquad$
Marc Dorfman Assistant Director Planning \& Regeneration

## Contact Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy

 Development Management Support Team Leader Tel: 02084895114
## 4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Planning staff and application case files are located at 639 High Road, London N17 8BD. Applications can be inspected at those offices $9.00 \mathrm{am}-5.00 \mathrm{pm}$, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment. In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.

The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5508, 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday.
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## HARINGEY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

# APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS BETWEEN <br> 24/01/2011 AND 20/02/2011 

## BACKGROUND PAPERS

For the purpose of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the background papers in respect of the following items comprise the planning application case file.

The planning staff and planning application case files are located at 639 High Road, London N17 8BD. Applications can be inspected at those offices $9.00 \mathrm{am}-5.00 \mathrm{pm}$, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment.
In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website:
www.haringey.gov.uk
From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.

The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5508, 9.00am-5.00pm, Monday - Friday.


| WARD: | Bounds Green |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2010/2214 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 44 Blake Road N11 2AE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: |  | Erection of two-storey side extension with accommodation within the roofspace (AMENDED |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## WARD: Bruce Grove





Officer: Jeffrey Holt
GTD
158 Tottenham Lane N8

Decision Date: 26/01/2011

Application No:
Decision:
Location: 158 Tottenham Lane N8

Proposal: Non-material amendments following a grant of planning permission HGY/2008/1643 to retain approved short wall / railings at 1.5 m high; to include central feature wall / piers at 1.8 m high with panel and sign; to omit 'goal post' over entrance and provide 1.8 m high piers either side of entrance.
Application No:

## Decision:

Location: Outside 70 Coolhurst Road N8 8EU
Proposal: Prior notification for installation of fibre cabinet, size 1210 mm (height) $\times 1410 \mathrm{~mm}$ (width) $\times 370 \mathrm{~mm}$ (depth).

| Application No: | HGY/2011/0032 | Officer: | Elizabeth Ennin-Gyasi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 15/02/2011 |
| Location: | 47 Glasslyn Road N8 8RJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendments following a grant planning permission HGY/2010/1862 for minor increase in projection of proposed balustrading. |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2011/0035 | Officer: | Jeffrey Holt |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 03/02/2011 |
| Location: | 32a Elm Grove N8 9AH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of obscure-glazed screening and improvement of access to existing roof |  |  |  |

## WARD: Fortis Green












Officer: John Ogenga P'Lakop
Decision Date: 18/02/2011

Location: $\quad 24$ Kerswell Close N15 5HT
Proposal: $\quad$ Retrospective planning application for retention of existing UPVC windows

| Application No: | HGY/2011/0073 | Officer: | John Ogenga P'Lakop |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 17/02/2011 |  |
| Location: | 26 Kerswell Close N15 5HT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Restrospective planning application for retention of existing UPVC windows/doors |  |  |  |

## WARD: Seven Sisters



| London Borough of Haringey <br> List of applications decided under delegated powers between | Page 29 <br> 24/01/2011 and 20/02/2011 | Paticer: | John Ogenga P'Lakop |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |




## WARD: Tottenham Green



## WARD: Tottenham Hale

| Application No: | HGY/2009/2164 | Officer: | Elizabeth Ennin-Gyasi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 09/02/2011 |
| Location: | Pumping Station, Marsh Lane N17 OUX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 3 (Sample of materials) attached to planning permission HGY/2007/0007. |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2010/1353 | Officer: | Elizabeth Ennin-Gyasi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 09/02/2011 |
| Location: | 658-660 High Road N17 OAB |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of Details pursuant to Condition 02A (samples of materials) attached to appeal ref APP/Y5420/A/08/2069261 (original planning ref HGY/2007/2245). |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2010/2293 | Officer: | John Ogenga P'Lakop |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 01/02/2011 |
| Location: | 60 Scotland G |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of ground floor front access porch |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2010/2334 | Officer: | Stuart Cooke |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/02/2011 |
| Location: | Non-material amendments following approval of details HGY/2008/1970 for amendments to courtyard and terrace landscaping (Block NW1) |  |  |  |
| Proposal: |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2011/0030 | Officer: | Jeffrey Holt |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 11/02/2011 |
| Location: | Mulberry Prima | oad N17 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Construction of doors to existing | attached of the ex | the existing nursery. Creation of ing playgrounds | w accessible |


| WARD: West Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Officer: Valerie Okeiyi

| Application No: | HGY/2010/2329 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 08/02/2011 |  |
| Location: | 78 Downhills Way N17 6BD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of vehicle crossover (householder application). |  |  |  |

WARD: White Hart Lane

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2010/2251 | Officer: Valerie Okeiyi |  | 26/01/2011 |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 60 De Quincey Road N17 7DJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of PVCu conservatory to the rear of the property. |  |  |  |
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Agenda item:
Planning Committee
On 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March 2011

| Report Title: Development Management, Building Control and Planning Enforcement <br> work report |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Report of: Niall Bolger Director of Urban Environment |  |
| Wards(s) affected: All | Report for: Planning Committee |

1. Purpose

To advise the Committee of performance statistics on Development Management, Building Control and Planning Enforcement.

## 2. Summary

Summarises decisions taken within set time targets by Development Management, Building Control and Planning Enforcement Work since the $14^{\mathrm{h}}$ February 2011 Planning Committee meeting.
3. Recommendations That the report be noted.

Report Authorised by:


Contact Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy Development Management Support Team Leader Tel: 02084895114

## 4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Planning staff and application case files are located at 639 High Road, London N17 8BD. Applications can be inspected at those offices 9.00am-5.00pm, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment. In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.

The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5508, 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday.
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Planning Committee 14 March 2011

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE STATISTICS

## NATIONAL INDICATOR NI 157 DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

## January 2011 Performance

In January 2011 there were 129 planning applications determined, with performance in each category as follows -

There were no major applications determined in January.
$84 \%$ of minor applications were determined within 8 weeks ( 26 out of 31 cases)
$82 \%$ of other applications were determined within 8 weeks ( 80 out of 98 cases)
For an explanation of the categories see Appendix I

## Year Performance - 2010/11

In the financial year 2010/11, up to the end of January, there were 1573 planning applications determined, with performance in each category as follows -
$38 \%$ of major applications were determined within 13 weeks (3 out of 8)
$81 \%$ of minor applications were determined within 8 weeks (262 out of 325 cases)
$85 \%$ of other applications were determined within 8 weeks (1053 out of 1240 cases)

The monthly performance for each of the categories is shown in the following graphs:
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Major Applications 2010/11


Minor Applications 2010/11
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## Other applications 2010/11



## Last 12 months performance - February 2010 to January 2011

In the 12 month period February 2010 to January 2011 there were 1840 planning applications determined, with performance in each category as follows -
$45 \%$ of major applications were determined within 13 weeks (5 out of 11)
$80 \%$ of minor applications were determined within 8 weeks ( 305 out of 381 cases)
$85 \%$ of other applications were determined within 8 weeks (1238 out of 1448 cases)

The 12 month performance for each category is shown in the following graphs:
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Major applications - last 12 months


Minor applications - last 12 months
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Other applications - last 12 months


## Background/Targets

NI 157 (formerly BV 109) is one of the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) National Indicators for 2010/11.

It sets the following targets for determining planning applications:
a. $60 \%$ of major applications within 13 weeks
b. $65 \%$ of minor applications within 8 weeks
c. $80 \%$ of other applications within 8 weeks

Haringey has set its own targets for 2010/11 in relation to NI 157. These are set out in Planning \& Regeneration (P\&R) Business Plan 2010-13 and are to determine:
a. $60 \%$ of major applications within 13 weeks
b. $65 \%$ of minor applications within 8 weeks
c. $80 \%$ of other applications within 8 weeks
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## Appendix I

## Explanation of categories

The NI 157 indicator covers planning applications included in the DCLG PS1/2 statutory return.

It excludes the following types of applications - TPO's, Telecommunications, Reserve Matters and Observations.

The definition for each of the category of applications is as follows:
Major applications -
For dwellings, where the number of dwellings to be constructed is 10 or more For all other uses, where the floorspace to be built is 1,000 sq.m. or more, or where the site area is 1 hectare or more.

Minor application -
Where the development does not meet the requirement for a major application nor the definitions of Change of Use or Householder Development.

Other applications -
All other applications, excluding TPO's, Telecommunications, Reserve Matters and Observations.
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## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PERFORMANCE STATISTICS

## GRANTED / REFUSAL RATES FOR DECISIONS

## January 2011 Performance

In January 2011, excluding Certificate of Lawfulness applications, there were 106 applications determined of which:
$76 \%$ were granted (81 out of 106)
$24 \%$ were refused ( 25 out of 106 )

## Year Performance - 2010/11

In the financial year 2010/11 up to the end of January, excluding Certificate of Lawfulness applications, there were 1324 applications determined of which:
$79 \%$ were granted (1052 out of 1324)
$21 \%$ were refused (272 out of 1324)
The monthly refusal rate is shown on the following graph:
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## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE STATISTICS

## LOCAL INDICATOR (FORMERLY BV204) APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

## January 2011 Performance

In January 2011 there were 5 planning appeals determined against Haringey's decision to refuse planning permission, with performance being as follows -
$0 \%$ of appeals allowed on refusals ( 0 out of 5 cases)
$100 \%$ of appeals dismissed on refusals (5 out of 5 cases)

## Year Performance - 2010/11

In the financial year 2010/11, up to the end of January, there were 66 planning appeals determined against Haringey's decision to refuse planning permission, with performance being as follows -
$24.2 \%$ of appeals allowed on refusals (16 out of 66 cases)
$75.8 \%$ of appeals dismissed on refusals (50 out of 66 cases)
The monthly performance is shown in the following graph:
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## Last 12 months performance - February 2010 to January 2011

In the 12 month period February 2010 to January 2011 there were 81 planning appeals determined against Haringey's decision to refuse planning permission, with performance being as follows -
$22.2 \%$ of appeals allowed on refusals (18 out of 81 cases)
$77.8 \%$ of appeals dismissed on refusals (63 out of 81 cases)
The monthly performance for this period is shown in the following graph:
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## Background/Targets

This is no longer included in DCLG's National Indicator set. However it has been retained as a local indicator.

It sets a target for the percentage of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse planning permission.

The target that was set by DCLG in 2007/08 was $30 \%^{\wedge}$
Haringey has set its own target for 2010/11 in relation to this local indicator. This is set out in P\&R Business Plan 2010-13.

The target set by Haringey for 2010/11 is $35 \%$
(^ The lower the percentage of appeals allowed the better the performance)
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## Building Control Performance Statistics

## February 2011 Performance

In February 2011 Building Control received 150 applications which were broken down as follows:-

48 Full Plans applications;
58 Building Notice applications;
38 Initial Notices and
6 Regularisation applications.

The trend for the number of Full Plan applications received in 2010-11 and for the pervious three years is shown on the following graph:


The trend for the number of Building Notice applications received in 2010-11 and for the pervious three years is shown on the following graph:
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Performance on applications received in February was as follows:
95\% of applications were validated within 3 days (against a target of 85\%)
The monthly performance is shown in the following graph:
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In terms of applications which were vetted and responded to, performance in February was as follows:

94\% were fully checked within 15 days (against a target of $85 \%$ )
The monthly performance is shown in the following graph:


Within the same period, Building Control also received:
Notification of 14 Dangerous Structures - 100\% of which were inspected within the target of 2 hours of receiving notification, and

11 Contraventions - $100 \%$ of which were inspected within the target of 3 days of receiving notification.

Also in February 2011, there were 68 commencements and 589 site inspections were undertaken to ensure compliance with the Regulations.

In terms of site inspections, in February 2011 the average number of site visits per application was 5.3 (against a target of 5 ). The monthly figures are shown in the following graph:
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For an explanation of the categories see Appendix A
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## Appendix A

Explanation of categories

Full Plans applications -

Building Notice -

Regularisation application -

Validation -

Site Inspections -

Applications for all types of work, where the applicant submits fully annotated drawings and details that are required to be fully checked by Building Control. When these are checked in the majority of cases a letter is sent to the applicant or their agents requesting clarification and/or changes to be made to the application in order to achieve compliance;

Applications for residential work only, where the applicant only has to submit the Notice and basic details, most of the compliance checks are carried out through site inspections;

Where works are carried out without an application having been made the owner may be prosecuted. However to facilitate people who wish to have work approved, in 1999 Building Control introduced a new process called Regularisation. A regularisation application is a retrospective application relating to previously unauthorised works i.e. works carried out without Building Regulations consent, started on or after the 11 November 1985. The purpose of the process is to regularise the unauthorised works and obtain a certificate of regularisation. Depending on the circumstances, exposure, removal and/or rectification of works may be necessary to establish compliance with the Building Regulations;

All applications that are received have to be validated to ensure that the application is complete and ready to be formally checked;

Inspections carried out by Building Control to ensure compliance with the Building Regulations and/or in the case of Dangerous Structures, inspections in order to determine the condition of the structure being reported as dangerous.
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| Dangerous Structures - | Building Control are responsible for checking all <br> notified dangerous structures on behalf of the <br> Council within 2 hours of notification, 24 hours a <br> day 365 days a year; |
| :--- | :--- |
| Contraventions - | Contraventions are reports of works being <br> carried out where no current Building Control <br> application exists. |
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## PLANNING COMMITTEE STATS FOR COMMITTEE MEEETING January 2011

## S. 330 - REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION SERVED

None

## ENFORCEMENT NOTICES SERVED (S188)

1. 49 Warham Road - Conversion of house to 3 flats

## BREACH OF CONDITION NOTICE SERVED

None

## TEMPORARY STOP NOTICES SERVED

None

## PLANNING CONTRAVENTION NOTICES SERVED

1. XX

## SECTION 215 (Untidy Site) NOTICE SERVED

## None

## PROSECUTIONS SENT TO LEGAL

None

## APPEAL DECISIONS

1. 216 West Green Road Appeal lapsed- fee not paid
2. 22 Lordsmead Road. Appeal allowed
3. 65 Park Ridings. Enforcement Notice Quashed on appeal

## SUCCESFUL PROSECUTIONS

1. 2 Goodwyns Vale

Convicted referred to Crown Court for Sentencing. Bail not granted

## APPEALS AGAINST PROSECUTIONS

1. 66 Wightman Road

## CAUTIONS

1. None
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## Agenda Item 9

Agenda item:
Planning Committee
On $14^{\text {th }}$ March 2011

| Report Title: Town \& Country Planning Act 1990 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Town \& Country Planning (Trees) Regulations 1999 |
| Report of: Marc Dorfman Director of Urban Environment |  |
| Wards(s) affected: Stroud Green | Report for: Planning Committee |

1. Purpose

The following report recommend Tree Preservation Orders be confirmed.
2. Summary

Details of confirmation of Tree Preservation Order against tree located at:

1. 29 Mount Pleas ont Villas N4
2. Recommendations

To confirm the attached Tree Preservation Orders.


Report Authorised by:

$\qquad$

$\bigcirc \rho$
Marc Dorfman Assistant Director Planning \& Regeneration

## Contact Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy

Development Management Support Team Leader
Tel: 02084895114

## 4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

With reference to the above Act the background papers in respect of the following reports summaries comprise the planning application case file.
The planning staff and case files are located at 639 High Road N17. Anyone wishing to inspect the background papers in respect of any of the following reports should contact Development Management Support Team on 02084895114.

## Page 56

This page is intentionally left blank

## Page 57

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 14 MARCH 2011

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

## TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (TREES) REGULATIONS 1999 <br> SUMMARY

This report seeks to confirm the Tree Preservation Order placed on the tree specified in this report.

REPORT
The trees are located at: 29 Mount Pleasant Villas N4
Species: G1. Consists of $4 \times$ Lime
Location: Front Garden
Condition: Fair
The Council's Arboriculturalist has reported as follows:
A Tree Preservation Order should be attached on the following grounds:

1. The trees are of amenity value, being clearly visible from a public place.
2. The trees appear healthy for their species and age and have a predicted life expectancy of 50-100 years.
3. The trees are suitable to their location.

No objections have been received in regard to the TPOs.
RECOMMENDATION
That the Tree Preservation Order upon the aforementioned trees under Section 198 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 be confirmed.


Paul Smith
Head Of Development Management
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This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. (c) Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. LBH Haringey 100019199 (2008)

## Site plan

29 Mount Pleasant Villas N4

## G1. $4 \times$ Lime

## Directorate of <br> Urban

Environment

Marc Dorfman Assistant Director Planning and Regeneration 639 High Road London N17 8BD

Tel 02084890000
Fax 02084895525

|  | Drawn by | AA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Scale | $1: 1250$ |
|  | Date | $13 / 03 / 2011$ |
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Agenda item:


Planning Committee
On 14 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March 2011

| Report Title: Planning applications reports for determination |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Report of: Niall Bolger Director of Urban Environment |  |
| Wards(s) affected: All | Report for: Planning Committee |

## 1. Purpose

Planning applications submitted to the above Committee for determination by Members.

## 2. Summary

All applications present on the following agenda consists of sections comprising a consultation summary, an officers report entitled planning considerations and a recommendation to Members regarding the grant or refusal of planning permission.
3. Recommendations

See following reports.
Report Authorised by:

- $\int$ Assistant Director Planning \& Regeneration

Contact Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy Development Management Support Team Leader Tel: 02084895114

## 4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

Planning staff and application case files are located at 639 High Road, London N17 8BD. Applications can be inspected at those offices $9.00 \mathrm{am}-5.00 \mathrm{pm}$, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment. In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.

The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5508, 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday.
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# REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE 

| Reference No: HGY/2011/0033 |
| :--- |
| Address: Mimosa Court, $27-31$ Avenue Road N15 St. Ann's |
| Proposal: Extension of time limit for implementation of planning permission |
| HGY/2004/0585 for infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, |
| an extension at third floor level to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat, 4 X 1 bed flats and the merging of |
| an existing 1 bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, |
| creation of lift and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors |
| Existing Use: Residential $\quad$ Proposed Use: Residential |
| Applicant: Crownbell Investments |
| Ownership: Private |
| Date received: 05/01/2011 Last amended date: $21 / 02 / 2010$ |
| Drawing number of plans: 0307/01A - 05A |
| Case Officer Contact: Jeffrey Holt |
| PLANNING DESIGNATIONS: |
| Road Network: Borough Road |
| RECOMMENDATION |
| GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions |
| SUMMARY OF REPORT: |
| This application takes advantage of new national regulations introduced in October |
| 2010 to permit applications to extend the timescale for implementing existing planning |
| permissions. These regulations were introduced to help address the impacts of the |
| economic recession and the property market downturn. |
| The application seeks an extension of time limit for implementation of planning permission |
| for infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, an extension at |
| third floor level to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat, $4 \times 1$ bed flats and the merging of an existing 1 |
| bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, creation of lift |
| and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors. The works are |
| considered to be sympathetic to the building and in keeping with the local area. Adequate |
| flats, amenity space and parking are provided and no harm to residential amenity would |
| arise. Haringey Planning Policy has remained effectively unchanged since grant of original |
| approval at committee and therefore APPROVAL of the extension of time limit is |
| recommended. |
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## 1. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1.1. The subject site is 4 -storey purpose-built post-war block of flats on the west side of Avenue Road. The building contains 20 flats comprising 5 bedsits, $7 \times 1$ bed flats and $8 \times 2$ bed flats. There is onsite parking for 15 cars and substantial rear amenity space. The surrounding area is residential and characterised by two storey terraced buildings.

## 2. PLANNING HISTORY

2.1. HGY/2004/0585 - Infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, an extension at third floor level to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat, $4 \times 1$ bed flats and the merging of an existing 1 bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, creation of lift and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors.
2.2. HGY/2003/1513 - Remodelling of existing block and erection of an additional floor to create $2 \times$ bed-sits, $13 \times 1$ bed and $10 \times 2$ bed flats in main block and erection of single storey building to rear to create $1 \times 1$ bed and $2 \times 2$ bed flats and associated alterations.

## 3. PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

3.1. Permission is sought for infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, an extension at third floor level to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat, $4 \times 1$ bed flats and the merging of an existing 1 bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, creation of lift and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors.
3.2. The rearrangement of the parking area will result in a reduction of parking from 15 spaces to 10.
3.3. A new hip-ended pitched roof is proposed over the entire building.

## 4. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.1 National Planning Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing
Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport
Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy
4.2 London Plan

Policy 3A. 1 Increasing London's supply of housing
Policy 3A. 2 Borough housing targets
Policy 3A. 3 Maximising the potential of sites
Policy 3A. 4 Efficient use of stock
Policy 3A. 9 Affordable Housing Targets
Policy 3A. 5 Housing choice
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Policy 3B. 1 Developing London's Economy
Policy 4A. 6 Quality of new Housing provision
Policy 4A. 7 Renewable Energy
Policy 4B. 1 Design Principles for a Compact City
Policy 4B. 8 Respect Local Context and Communities

### 4.3 Unitary Development Plan

Policy G1: Environment
Policy G2: Development and Urban Design
Policy G3: Employment
Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy UD3 General Principles
Policy UD4 Quality Design
Policy UD7 Waste Storage
Policy HSG1 New Housing Development
Policy HSG10 Dwelling Mix
Policy M10 Parking for Development
Policy UD8 Planning obligations

### 4.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2008)
SPG1a: Design Guidance and Design Statements
SPG4: Access for All - Mobility Standards
SPG5: Safety by Design
SPG8a: Waste and Recycling
SPG8b: Materials
SPG9: Sustainability Statement
SPG10a: The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations
SPG10c: Educational needs generated by new housing
5. CONSULTATION

| Statutory | Internal | External |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ward Councillors | Transportation | Local Residents |
|  | Cleansing | 21-36 (incl.) Avenue Road |
|  | Building Control | $42-60$ (e) North Grove |
|  |  | $58 \mathrm{~b}, 52,40,42$ North Grove |
|  |  | Total No of Residents |
|  |  | Consulted: 28 |

## 6. RESPONSES

### 6.1. Local Residents:

One objection received from a local resident

- The existing flats are unsightly, fencing and hoardings have been in place for months, the building is still fire damaged, insufficient bins, bins being left in the street, litter
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- More development would mean more rubbish for existing bins
- Approval should only be given if the existing flats are better managed

Two objections were received in response to the original application ref:HGY/2004/0585

- 40 North Grove - Objection - The proposal would dominate the skyline and result in the removal of several trees in the rear amenity space to the detriment of the locality.
- 42 North Grove - Objection - The proposal will result in overlooking and overshadowing onto my property. The removal of several trees in the rear amenity space of the subject site will be to the detriment of the locality. The proposal will be unsightly and cause car parking problems.


### 6.2. Transportation Team

Although, this development is sited where the public transport accessibility level is low, it has not been identified within the Council's adopted 2006 UDP as that renowned to have car parking pressure. In addition, this development proposal is located within a walking distance of the bus route, St. Ann's Road, providing some 12buses per hour (two-way) travel option for some of the residents to connect with the busy bus corridor on Seven Sisters Road. We have also considered that the proposed development will not generate any significant traffic or car parking demand that would adversely affect the adjoining highways network.

Consequently, the highway and transportation authority would not object to this application subject to the condition that:

The applicant provides 5 cycle racks with secure shelter.
Reason: To improve the conditions for cyclist at this location.
Informative:
The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020
8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address

## 7. ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

7.1. The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- Background
- Size, bulk and design
- Privacy and overlooking
- Transportation
- Amenity Space
- Trees
- Objector's comments
- Environmental Impact Assessment
- Equalities Impact Assessment
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## Background

7.2. This application seeks an extension of the time limit within which to implement the planning permission HGY/2004/0585 granted $25^{\text {th }}$ July 2007 for extensions to create additional dwellings in the building. The original outline consent lasts for 5 years however the applicant has not been able proceed with development during this time.
7.3. New procedures were introduced by central government on 1 October 2010 allowing applicants to apply to renew planning permissions. The purpose of this new provision is to keep planning permissions alive for longer during the economic downturn so that development can be implemented more quickly when economic conditions improve.
7.4. Under this procedure, the proposal does not differ from that originally approved as the application simply refers to the documents submitted for the previous permission.

## Size, bulk and design

7.5. The proposed extensions will change the building's current form as a flat roof modern block with a recessed upper floor to a more traditional building with a hipped roof and uniform floor sizes. The infill extension on the ground floor replaces much of the undercroft parking and provides a more pedestrian friendly interface with the street.
7.6. The proposal respects the height and architectural style of the existing building but consolidates its form to create a more complete building. The proposal will fill out the top floor, which is half built to the rear, creating a uniform structure.
7.7. The resulting building is considered to be an acceptable design improving the appearance of the original building and in keeping with the character of surrounding development.

## Privacy and overlooking

7.8. The proposal will add new flats to the front of the $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor of the building by extending over the existing flats on the second floor, bringing these floors in alignment. The windows of these new flats will have a similar outlook to the forward facing flats on the second floor. Consequently, there would be no significant change to existing conditions of overlooking.
7.9. The additional bulk resulting from the enlarged $3^{\text {rd }}$ floor and new hipped roof will cast a shadow which would mostly fall on Avenue Road and the existing rear garden to the block of flats. Early in the morning and late in the evening, the shadow would reach neighbouring properties but due to the angle of the sun at these times, the resulting shadow would not be significantly different to what is cast by the existing building.
7.10. It is considered that the proposal will not be unacceptably detrimental to the amenity of adjacent residents or occupiers.
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## Amenity Space

7.11. According to the Housing Supplementary Planning Document, the resulting block of flats in its entirety would require $160 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ of amenity as there would be a total of 27 flats in the development. The remaining amenity space after some of the rear garden has been converted to parking is $183 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ in area, which exceeds the minimum required by the SPD. As such the resulting amenity space provision is considered sufficient.

## Standard of Accommodation

7.12. The development will create additional $3 \times 2$ bed flats and $4 \times 1$ bed flats. These flats were considered acceptable having regard to the superseded SPG3a 'Density Dwelling Mix Floorspace Minima Conversions Extensions Lifetime Homes'. As the current Housing SPD, which replace SPG3a, has the same floorspace minima, it is considered that effectively, policy requirements have not changed since the original permission. As the scheme itself has not changed either, it is considered the proposed accommodation is acceptable in policy terms.

## Transportation

7.13. The ground floor infill extension will occupy much of the existing car parking space on the ground floor. A replacement parking area will be provided in part of the existing rear garden but there will be an overall reduction from 16 to 10 spaces. One complainant raised the issue of additional car parking congestion.
7.14. The Council's Transportation team have assessed the proposal and do not object. Although, this development is sited where the public transport accessibility level is low, it has not been identified within the Council's adopted 2006 UDP as that renowned to have car parking pressure. In addition, this development proposal is located within a walking distance of the bus route, St. Ann's Road, providing some 12 buses per hour (two-way) travel option for some of the residents to connect with the busy bus corridor on Seven Sisters Road. We have also considered that the proposed development will not generate any significant traffic or car parking demand that would adversely affect the adjoining highways network.
7.15. Transportation have recommended that a conditions be attached requiring the provision of secure and sheltered storage for 5 cycles should permission be granted.

## Trees

7.16. The application will require removal of one tree in the rear communal garden. This tree is not protected or visible from the public realm. It is in the centre of the garden and not directly adjacent to a neighbouring property. The loss of this tree is not considered to be harmful to the amenity of the surrounding area.

## Objectors' Comments

7.17. Two objections were received in response to the original application and one in response to the current application. The two original objections referred to loss of a tree, parking congestion, appearance, overlooking and overshadowing. The current
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objection refers to the current management of the building and increased rubbish from the new flats.
7.18. These issues have been addressed in the preceding sections. It is considered that the above impacts will not arise or will of a sufficiently harmful degree to warrant refusal.

## Environmental Impact Assessment

7.19. The application site area is less than 0.5ha and as such an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

Equalities Impact Assessment
7.20. In determining this application the Committee is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equalities Act 2010.
7.21. The impact of this scheme has been considered in relation to the Equalities Act 2010 in terms of its Equality and Race Relations impacts. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. The works include a new lift serving all floors. As such, all dwelling will be fully accessible for disabled users. Otherwise, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation with relevant groups) that different groups have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to the particular planning application.
7.22. In terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant specific adverse impacts as a result of the development.
8. CONCLUSION
8.1. This application takes advantage of new national regulations introduced in October 2010 to permit applications to extend the timescale for implementing existing planning permissions. These regulations were introduced to help address the impacts of the economic recession and the property market downturn.
8.2. The applications seeks an extension of time limit for permission HGY/2004/0585 for infill of ground floor and existing garage area to create $2 \times 2$ bed flats, an extension at third floor level to create 1 X 2 bed flat, 4 X 1 bed flats and the merging of an existing 1 bed flat to create $1 \times 2$ bed flat; and the rearrangement of car parking area, creation of lift and installation of front bay window to the ground, first and second floors.
8.3. The resulting building is considered to be an acceptable design improving the appearance of the original building and in keeping with the character of surrounding development.
8.4. Neighbouring properties will not suffer from undue loss of light or privacy relative to existing levels of harm.
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8.5. The application site is large enough to accommodate the new parking area while maintaining sufficient amenity space for the resulting number of flats.
8.6. The flats have an acceptable size and layout having regard to the nature of the building and conversion.
8.7. The proposed level of parking provision is considered adequate by Haringey's Transportation Team.
8.8. Overall, the scheme is considered to be satisfactory and an extension of time limit would be in compliance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', HSG1 'New Housing Development', and M10 'Parking for Development' of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Council's 'Housing' SPD.

## 8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions
Applicant's drawing No.(s): 0307/01A - 05A
Subject to the following condition(s)

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. The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality.
4. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development to include detailed drawings of:
a. those existing trees to be retained.
b. those existing trees to be removed.
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c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be agreed with the Council's Arboriculturalist.
d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.
5. 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.
6. No development shall take place until details of a refurbishment and repair scheme for the block of flats has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include detailed plans, drawings, materials used as specifications. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to secure the adequate refurbishment and repair of the entire building in the interests of quality accommodation and visual amenity.
7. No more than $50 \%$ of the new dwellings comprised within the development hereby authorised shall be occupied until the refurbishment and repair scheme works carried out in accordance with the details submitted and approved in condition 06 have been carried out.

Reason: In order to secure the adequate refurbishment and repair of the entire building in the interests of quality accommodation and visual amenity.

## REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The development is considered to be satisfactory and in compliance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', HSG1 'New Housing Development', and M10 'Parking for Development' of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Council's 'Housing' SPD. Consequently, granting permission to replace extant permission HGY/2004/0585 is acceptable.
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This map is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery
Office. Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. LBH Haringey
100019199 (2008)

## Site plan <br> Mimosa Court, 27-31 Avenue Road N15 5JF
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