

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

Councillors: Basu, Beacham, Demirci (Chair), Erskine, Hare, Peacock (Vice-Chair), Rice, Waters and Wilson

Also Present: Councillor Strang

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PC99.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>  Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Schmitz, for whom Cllr Wilson was substituting.	
<b>PC100.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>  There were no new items of urgent business. A revised version of the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2011, had been circulated in advance of the meeting in relation to agenda item 5.	
<b>PC101.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>PC102.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b>  There were no deputations or petitions.	
<b>PC103.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>  The Sub Committee considered the revised version of the minutes of the 5 <sup>th</sup> December 2011 meeting, which replaced the version originally included in the agenda pack to include the conditions attached to those planning applications granted.  <b>RESOLVED</b>  That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair.	
<b>PC104.</b>	<b>HGY/2011/2016 – 58 JAMESON LODGE, SHEPHERDS HILL, N6</b> The Sub Committee resolved to vary the order of the agenda to take agenda item 10 next, followed by item 9 and then items 6 and 7.  The Sub Committee considered a report, previously circulated,	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

regarding an application for planning permission at 58 Jameson Lodge, Shepherds Hill, N6. The application set out details of the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and analysis of the application. The report recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions. An appeal decision in respect of a previous application on the site had been circulated for the information of Sub Committee Members. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining the key aspects of the report and responded to questions from Sub Committee Members.

In response to a question regarding the difference between the application which had previously been refused and the current application, the Planning Officer advised that the previous proposal extended over the entire roof area and it was felt that this would be visually intrusive in relation to neighbouring Panorama Court, while the current application for the development of the roof area was set back on the side facing Panorama Court. It was confirmed that the proposals for the lower ground floor had no planning history. It was further confirmed that the proposal did not include any expansion of the existing parking area.

Cllr Paul Strang, Ward Councillor, and three local residents addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal, and raised the following points:

- The needs of and impact on local residents were not taken into account;
- There were no feasible refuse arrangements proposed, and current arrangements were inadequate for existing occupants of the site;
- The proposal did not incorporate a mix of different-sized units, to reflect the housing needs in the area;
- The proposal would result in loss of sunlight to at least one nearby residence;
- No consideration had been given to the impact on the Conservation Area – the proposed addition to the roof would make the building much higher than surrounding buildings and the contrasting materials proposed would be incompatible with the Conservation Area environment;
- Parking arrangements would be inadequate to cope with increased occupation of the site;
- There was concern that this could lead to ‘development creep’;
- There would be a loss of communal space as more residents were required to share the same outdoor amenity and there would be a loss of access to potential internal storage space, although this was currently not used under the terms of the current leaseholds;
- The proposal represented over-development of a small site;

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

- The scheme would be visually intrusive and should be set back further at the roof level;
- Disturbance during construction of the scheme would cause significant distress to existing residents;

In response to questions from the Committee to the objectors, the following issues were covered;

- Residents were concerned that there would be an application to expand the parking area in future, resulting in a loss of existing soft landscaping;
- There were concerns that it would be impossible to accommodate waste bins for an increased number of residents and meet the requirements for additional recycling within the space allotted in the proposal;
- It was confirmed that at least 4 of the garages on the property were used for motor vehicle storage;
- The existing flats were a mixture of 2-bed and 1-bed flats, and were generously proportioned;

The architect for the site, Mr Plant, addressed the Sub Committee in support of the applications and to address points raised during the discussion. Mr Plant discussed the following issues during his address:

- The intention of the scheme was to enhance the existing building within the Conservation Area and to improve its aesthetics in respect of the fenestration and the context of the neighbouring buildings.
- It was felt that the creation of 5 additional 1-bed units would lead to an appropriate overall mix at the site of 7 x 2-bed units and 9 x 1-bed units. It was not felt that the top floor or lower ground would be appropriate locations for family accommodation;
- The existing parking provisions were well in excess of those required under the UDP, even for an increased number of units at the site. The site was not considered to be in an area of high parking pressure and there was on-street parking in the vicinity;
- The applicants had endeavoured to engage with local residents regarding the proposals and it was hoped that this dialogue would continue in order to minimise the impact on residents during construction, although it was acknowledged that it was inevitable that there would be some disturbance during construction;
- There had previously been some issues regarding overlooking in respect of flat number 9, but these had now been addressed and there was no outstanding overlooking issues at the site.

The Committee asked questions of the applicant, as a result of which the following points were made:

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

- It was not felt that the proposed refuse provision would have an impact on site access;
- Basic measurements had been carried out based on BRE guidelines, according to which it was not believed that there would be any loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties as a result of the development;
- A standard condition was proposed with regards to permissible hours of construction, as a means of addressing concerns regarding disturbance during construction – the applicants confirmed that this was acceptable to them;
- An engineer had looked at the issue of water-pressure for the proposed new top-floor units, and the applicants were confident that there would be no problems in maintaining the existing water pressure for all units;
- It was confirmed that the proposed layout of the new top floor would make it impossible for any overlooking of existing balconies.

The Committee examined the plans for the proposal, and asked further questions of officers. In response to questions from the Committee, officers confirmed that it was their view that:

- The set-back of the proposed additional roof units was sufficient to address any concerns regarding visual intrusion;
- There would be no issue regarding loss of daylight or sunlight, as this had not been identified as an issue with the previous application;
- A condition was proposed requiring further details regarding refuse arrangements and any issues arising from this would be addressed at the detailed stage;
- There was a need for units of all sizes in the borough, and it would be necessary to demonstrate evidence of harm if the scheme were to be rejected on the grounds that the proposal did not include a mixture of unit sizes.
- It would be possible for a condition to be added preventing the expansion of the parking provision into the existing soft landscaping, which should be retained as a garden, with the exception of the site of the proposed bike shed.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report, with the inclusion of an additional condition preventing the expansion of the parking provision into the existing soft landscaping, which should be retained as a garden, with the exception of the site of the proposed bike shed, and on a vote of 6 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention it was:

**RESOLVED**

That application HGY/2011/2016 be granted, subject to

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

conditions.

Conditions:

**IMPLEMENTATION**

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.

**MATERIALS & SITE LAYOUT**

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 development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. A scheme for the treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development including the planting of trees and/or shrubs shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to provide a suitable setting for the proposed development in the interests of visual amenity and protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

**CONSTRUCTION**

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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

**WASTE**

6. 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 amenity of the locality.

7. That with the exception of the proposed bicycle storage area, shown on the approved drawings, all the existing garden areas on the site shall be retained and shall not be used for the expansion of car parking spaces on site.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenities of the existing and future occupiers of the property.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposed development is considered to complement the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, bulk and appearance and is generally appropriate to the location. It is considered the proposed addition is of an appropriate size and bulk in relation to the original block and is set back from the edges of the block to retain its original shape and appearance. Also, it will not result in excessive height relative to other similar blocks in the surrounding area. The proposed lightwell and extension at lower ground floor level will not detract from the front of the building.

In terms of design and appearance, the proposed addition is considered to be appropriate to the existing building in that the structure is lightweight in contrasting materials appropriate to the location and so complies with policy CSV5. It is also considered that the proposal will not cause loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking or overshadowing, 13.2.3 As such the proposal is in accordance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', M10 'Parking for Development' and HSG1 'New Housing Development' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and the Councils SPG1a 'Design Guidance', Housing SPD (October 2008), SPG3b 'Privacy/Overlooking, Aspect/Outlook and Daylight/Sunlight', SPG8b 'Materials' and SPG2 'Conservation and Archaeology'. It is therefore appropriate to recommend an approval.

Section 106: No

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

<b>PC105.</b>	<p><b>HGY/2011/1415 – UNITS 1 &amp; 2 QUICKSILVER PLACE, WESTERN ROAD, N22</b></p> <p>The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out the application for planning permission for permanent use of premises as sui generis (police use) at Units 1 and 2 Quicksilver Place, Western Road, N22 6UH. The report covered details of the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and analysis of the application. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining key points of the application, and responded to questions from the Committee.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Committee regarding land use in this area, it was confirmed that outside of the major Heartlands development proposed for the area north of Clarendon Road and south of Coburg Road, other applications in the area were being considered on a site-by-site basis. There was a focus on not impacting on the growth of cultural businesses in the Chocolate Factory vicinity. It was confirmed that the Committee had the option to grant permission for a time-limited period, but that this was not recommended by officers and that valid planning reasons would be required if such a decision were to be taken.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was:</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That application HGY/2011/1415 be approved, subject to conditions.</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The permission hereby granted shall not endure for the benefit of the land but shall be personal to the Metropolitan Police Authority only, and shall be upon the Metropolitan Police Authority ceasing to use the land the use shall be discontinued and shall revert to the authorised use as General Industrial (B2).</li></ol> <p>Reason: Permission has only been granted with respect to the special circumstances of the applicant and would not otherwise be granted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li></ol>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

	<p>Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.</p> <p><b>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</b></p> <p>The proposal is approved on the grounds that the use would not interfere with the regeneration of Haringey Heartlands and has successfully been in operation for the last 6 years without causing detriment to the amenities of any local residents by way of noise and disturbances. In addition there is a clear need to retain the patrol base as this would help to meet the need for Police Facilities as identified in the Community Infrastructure Plan. As such the proposal is in compliance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', ENV6 'Noise Pollution' and EMP1 'Defined Employment Areas' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<b>PC106.</b>	<p><b>APPEAL DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Sub Committee considered a report on appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during November 2011 of which 3 (25%) were allowed and 9 were dismissed.</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	
<b>PC107.</b>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Sub Committee considered a report on decisions made under delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the Sub Committee between 21 November and 18 December 2011.</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>	
<b>PC108.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>	
<b>PC109.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday, 13 February 2012, 7pm.</p> <p>It was reported that it was intended that this meeting be used for consideration of three applications in respect of the Tottenham Hotspur development at Northumberland Park and that a special meeting would be scheduled for consideration of other planning applications for this month. A guidance note on declarations of</p>	



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2012**

	<p>interest in respect of the Spurs applications would be circulated to Members in advance of the meeting, and Members were encouraged to contact officers in Legal Services for advice on this issue if needed.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The meeting closed at 20:40hrs.</p>	
--	--	--

COUNCILLOR ALI DEMIRCI

Chair