

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

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

Also Present: Councillor Martin Newton

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PC120.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>  Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Erskine, for whom Cllr Wilson was substituting.	
<b>PC121.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>  There were no new items of urgent business.  The Committee was advised that agenda items 6 and 7, in respect of 274 Archway Road, were to be deferred to the next meeting, as well as agenda item 9.2, in respect of a TPO at St Luke's Hospital.  <b>NOTED</b>	
<b>PC122.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  There were no declarations of interest.	
<b>PC123.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b>  There were no deputations or petitions.	
<b>PC124.</b>	<b>274 ARCHWAY ROAD, N6 5AU</b>  This item was deferred to the next meeting.	
<b>PC125.</b>	<b>274 ARCHWAY ROAD, N6 5AU</b>  This item was deferred to the next meeting.	
<b>PC126.</b>	<b>TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS</b>  The Chair requested that the agenda be varied in order to take items 9 and 10 next.  <u>St Luke's Hospital, Woodside Avenue, N10</u>  This item was deferred to the next meeting of the Sub Committee.	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

1 Parham Way, N10

The Committee considered a report seeking to confirm the TPO placed on a tree at 1 Parham Way. Alex Fraser, Arboricultural Officer, advised that a number of TPOs had been implemented at this site – the location of the tree in question was not that as set out in the plan attached report, but was located south of the specimen identified on the plan. An objection had been submitted that a TPO would prevent work being undertaken on the tree, although it was confirmed that permission could be sought in order to carry out necessary works. It was also felt that the distance of the tree from the nearest property meant that damage to the property was unlikely. The specimen was described as a mature ash in good health, with a predicted remaining lifespan of over 40 years. The tree was felt to be beneficial to wildlife and the local amenity.

The Committee noted that the report provided referred to a Lawson Cypress – it was confirmed that this was not the tree under discussion, but was one of the other trees on the site where TPOs had been implemented.

The Committee sought legal advice on making a decision based on a report which referred to a different tree. Serinther Atkar, Legal Officer, advised that the TPO procedure was predicated on consultation; in the event that local residents may not have had the correct information on which to take a view, it was advised that this decision should be deferred and brought back with a correct report. Otherwise there was a risk that the decision could be challenged.

The Committee requested that, when the report was brought back to the Committee, information be provided on the height of the tree and its distance from the closest structural foundations. It was also requested that report title should be updated to reflect the correct location of the specimen in question.

The Committee noted that, as the tree was situated within a Conservation Area, it had a level of protection under the legislation governing Conservation Areas, regardless of the implementation of a TPO.

**RESOLVED**

That this item be deferred to the next meeting of the Sub Committee.

Cascade Avenue, Tennis Courts, N10

Mr Fraser reported that the TPO had been requested as the site was being sold and may be developed. An inspection of the trees in question had found them to be of high amenity value, in good

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

health and with a predicted remaining lifespan of more than 40 years. Objections had been received on the grounds that the trees were ill-formed, of low amenity value and in an inappropriate location, and a local resident had expressed concern regarding the proximity of one of the trees to their property. It was the view of the arboricultural officer that the trees could be appropriately managed by pruning, both were healthy and the closest tree to the neighbouring property was over 20m away.

In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Fraser advised that the trees were 10-15m in height.

**RESOLVED**

That the TPO on the trees specified in the report at Cascade Avenue, Tennis Courts, N10 be confirmed.

**PC127.**

**APPEAL DECISIONS**

The Committee considered the report on appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during December 2011 and January 2012. It was noted that the proportion of appeals allowed during this period was higher than earlier in the year and impacted negatively on performance rates overall for the year.

In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Dorfman advised that no single reason had been identified for number of appeals allowed during the period. Increased resources were now available for management of appeals and an improved system was in place; performance had been positive for the rest of the year, and it was felt that this period represented an anomaly.

The Committee asked about the decision in respect of 30 Alexandra Park road, which had been allowed when other crossovers on the same road had been refused. It was reported that a decision would only be contested in the event that the Inspector had made a procedural or legal error – Mr Dorfman confirmed that he would look into the case to determine whether it was felt that there were grounds to challenge the decision, and would also consider whether it was felt that there was the risk of a precedent being set, and would write to the Committee regarding these issues. Malcolm Smith, Transportation, also agreed that he would look into this case in more detail.

The Committee questioned the win / loss approach to appeals, as it was most important that good planning decisions were being made for the benefit of the Borough. It was also suggested that it might be useful to have a summary of each decision included in

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

the report. Mr Dorfman advised that it was expected nationally that a planning authority would lose around 30-40% of appeals; previous performance had demonstrated that Haringey had been supporting planning policy well and that decisions made had been robust. Each appeal report was up to 10 pages in length – Mr Dorfman agreed that he was happy to make these available to Committee Members if they wished, but that it might be cumbersome to incorporate them into the report. It was suggested that analysis of appeals performance could be considered at Regulatory Committee.

In response to a request from Cllr Schmitz, Mr Dorfman agreed to supply him with a copy of the Inspector's report in respect of 155 Lordship Lane.

**RESOLVED**

That the content of the report be noted.

**PC128.**

**LAND AT GILSON PLACE AND COPPETTS ROAD N10 1JP**

The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, on the application for planning permission for land at Gilson Place and Coppetts Road, N10. The report set out details of the proposal, site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and analysis of the application. The report recommended that consent be granted, subject to conditions and a section 106 legal agreement. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining key aspects of the report, and advised of changes to the report as circulated, namely;

- The contribution towards education facilities at (1.1) of Recommendation 1 of the report be amended to £178,000.00.
- That affordable social housing in the penultimate line of (1.2) of Recommendation 1 of the report be amended to "affordable rent housing".
- That the total amount given in (1.6) of Recommendation 1 in the report be amended to £293,000.00.
- In addition it was noted that the s106 would secure local employment and the offer of apprenticeships (during construction); the details of which would be considered by Officers
- There were a number of revised plan numbers as follows: 012C, 013C, 014C, 15C, 016D, 22D & 23A
- The wording of condition 10 as set out in the report to be amended to "*A supporting statement shall be submitted demonstrating consistency with submitted Energy Assessment including the siting of the PV panels. Thereafter the renewable energy technology/ system shall be installed in accordance with the details approved and an independent post-installation review, or other*

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

*verification process as agreed, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming the agreed technology has been installed prior to the occupation of the buildings hereby approved.”*

- The wording of condition 14 as set out in the report to be amended to *“Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a serving and delivery management plan should be submitted for the approval of the LPA. The CLP should show the routeing of traffic around the immediate road network and reasonable endeavours ensure that deliveries are timed to avoid the peak traffic hours.”*

The Committee was referred to PPS4 of the national guidance, which established a flexible approach to employment land, and was also advised of the new ‘Haringey Employment Land Update’, February 2012, which indicated a general need to assess sites on their individual merits.

The Planning Officer responded to questions from the Committee, and the following points were covered in discussion:

- In response to a question as to why change of use was recommended, it was reported that the site had been vacant for a long time, there was no current employment use and there were constraints regarding the delivery of employment use such as warehousing or distribution, as this would disturb neighbouring residents. It was further reported that there was an oversupply of B1 floor space, and that this was not an ideal location for such use, as it was in an area with a low PTAL assessment.
- The Committee asked about access to the North Circular, and the impact of this on the site’s viability for employment use. It was reported that access between the site and North Circular would be shared with the residential estate, which would create problems in respect of B8 usage (storage and distribution), such as pedestrian safety and noise nuisance.
- The Committee asked about the evidence supplied by the applicants in respect of the marketing of the site. It was reported that the only evidence supplied was the planning statement. Concerns were expressed regarding the lack of independent information to verify the assertions made in respect of the way in which the site had been marketed; it was reported that this site was not a designated employment area and that empty floorspace should be brought back into use where possible – the officer’s recommendation was that this site was more suitable for residential use. Officers had witnessed for sale signs at the site for in recent years, and the site had remained vacant.
- The Committee questioned the recommendations of the report, and whether these were permitted under the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

Council's existing scheme of delegations – it was agreed that Recommendations 2 and 3 as set out in the report be deleted.

- The Committee noted the criticisms of the scheme made by the design panel, and asked about the status of the design panel's observations; it was reported that, further to the panel's comments regarding the courtyard layout, this element of the scheme had been redesigned so as to partly break up the courtyard, although it was still necessary to incorporate the appropriate number of parking spaces. It was felt that the new design of the courtyard space was an improvement in respect of delineation of space and landscaping.
- The Committee asked about the internal layout of the blocks; it was reported that it was felt that the internal layout worked well, as individual access to each block removed the need for long corridors, and access had now been included via the front of the blocks in order to improve navigation of the space.

Cllr Martin Newton, Ward Councillor, and two local residents addressed the Committee in objection to the application, and raised the following points:

- The privacy and amenity of long term residents would be negatively impacted by this development – the proposal would lead to overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens.
- This was one of several car-dependent new developments in the area, but there had been no associated improvements to local infrastructure to support them.
- The Committee had previously requested a condition that change of use at this site should not be 'waved through' and that there would be consultation on any proposal to change the use. Any decision to change the use from employment needed to be rigorously tested before such a decision was taken.
- The previous scheme was reduced to single-storey with office accommodation in the roof, following a previous refusal. The previously-consented office accommodation had been conditional on the incorporation of frosted glazing and would not have caused overlooking, but this would not be the case with the current proposals for two-storey residential accommodation, which would look straight into the gardens and rear rooms of neighbouring houses.
- The proposed location of the new houses was too close to existing houses, and the boundary wall was not high enough to protect residents' privacy. There was particular concern regarding the loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens in summer.
- The proposal may impact neighbours' sunlight in the early

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

evening.

Local residents showed a photograph of the proximity of the proposed houses to their properties. The Committee examined the plans and drawings.

The Committee asked further questions of officers:

- It was confirmed that a summary of the marketing undertaken for the site was set out in the report at paragraph 7.9 on page 49 of the agenda pack.
- In response to a request by the Committee, it was confirmed that the existing condition relating to landscaping could be amended to address the boundary treatment, with a view to increasing the level of screening between the site and existing properties, and also ensure the provision of trees with the courtyard area.
- It was also confirmed that the existing condition relating to parking spaces would be re-worded such that plans for the design and layout of the parking spaces must be submitted to the Council for approval, in order to facilitate pedestrian access to the building.
- It was confirmed that cycle parking provision was 1 space per one- or two-bedroom units and 2 spaces per larger dwelling.
- In response to a question regarding the consultation that was promised in respect of change of use, it was confirmed that this was part of this planning application process, which was consulted on in the usual way. It was confirmed that no separate consultation process was required.

The Chair moved recommendations 1 and 4 of the report, with the wording of the existing conditions in respect of landscaping and parking to be amended to reflect the Committee's requests that landscaping at the boundary of the site address the issue of screening, that trees be located within the courtyard area and that the design of the parking spaces layout be submitted to the Council for approval, and it was:

**RESOLVED**

- i) That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2011/1833, subject to a pre-condition that the owners of the application site shall first have entered into 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 £178,000.00 towards

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

educational facilities within the Borough (£86,000.00 for primary and £92,000.00 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) The identified 5 residential units to be provided as affordable intermediate housing and the identified 6 residential units to be provided as affordable rent housing and retained in perpetuity as such;
- (1.3) A contribution of £110,000.00 is being sought for a range of highway improvement measures to facilitate sustainable travel to and from the site;
- (1.4) To submit and agree a Travel Plan prior to the commencement of the development, prepared in line with TFL travel guidance and to comply with the TFL ATTrBuTE;
- (1.5) Schedule B of the Agreement dated 15 December 2005, entered into between Lynx Express Ltd, George Wimpey North London Ltd and the Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Haringey (relating to the "Commercial Land"), shall cease to have effect;
- (1.6) Securing local employment and the offer of apprenticeships (during construction);
- (1.7) The developer to pay an administration / monitoring cost of £5,000.00 in connection with this Section 106 agreement. This gives a total amount of £293,000.00

- ii) That following completion of the Agreement referred to in (1) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application no. HGY/2011/1833 and the Applicant's drawing No's 10/055/010B, 011B, 012C, 013C, 014C, 15C, 016D, 017A, 018, 019b, 020A, 021A, 022D, 023A, 024. JBA11/80-01.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

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.

**EXTERNAL APPEARANCE & 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. The hard landscaping shall be completed before the premises are first occupied. The soft landscaping shall be completed within 12 months, or by the end of the first planting season, after the completion of the development to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Any trees, or plants which die within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development; are removed, or become seriously damaged, or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

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

5. Notwithstanding the approved landscaping plans details of additional planting to be provided along rear boundary of the gardens to the terrace properties shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved.

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area and neighbouring residents.

6. Notwithstanding the approved plans and details the development hereby approved shall not commence until a revised site layout plan showing car parking layout, including the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

provision of a least 2 disable parking space and pedestrian access points to the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with these approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory layout; to ensure parking is provided in accordance with the Council's standards and in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety.

7. Before the development hereby permitted commences, details of enclosures and screened facilities for the storage of recycling containers and wheeled refuse bins and/or other refuse storage containers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be provided at the site in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development and satisfactory accessibility; and to protect the amenities of the area.

8. Details including the type, specification and location of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the residential units are occupied and thereafter carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent adverse light pollution to neighbouring properties

**TREE PROTECTION**

9. All works associated with this development shall be undertaken in accordance with the detail as specified in the Arboricultural Report & Method Statement.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

10. A pre-commencement site meeting must take place with the Architect, the consulting Arboriculturist, the Local Authority Arboriculturist, the Planning Officer to confirm tree protective measures to be implemented. All protective measures must be installed prior to the commencement of works on site and shall be inspected by the Council Arboriculturist and thereafter be retained in place until the works are complete.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY / SUSTAINABILITY**

11. A supporting statement shall be submitted demonstrating

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

consistency with submitted Energy Assessment including the siting of the PV panels. Thereafter the renewable energy technology/ system shall be installed in accordance with the details approved and an independent post-installation review, or other verification process as agreed, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming the agreed technology has been installed prior to the occupation of the buildings hereby approved.

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

12. Details of electric vehicle charging points to be provided for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: In order to contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

#### CONSTRUCTION

13. Before the development commences other than for investigative work:

a) A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:-

- o a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- o refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- o the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

Planning Authority.

c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site. Where remediation of contamination on the site is required completion of the remediation detailed in the method statement shall be carried out and a report that provides verification that the required works have been carried out, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development is occupied.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.

14. 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

15. Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a serving and delivery management plan should be submitted for the approval of the LPA. The CLP should show the routeing of traffic around the immediate road network and reasonable endeavours ensure that deliveries are timed to avoid the peak traffic hours.

Reason: To minimise vehicular conflict at this location.

**PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT**

16. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No 2) (England) Order 2008 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development otherwise permitted by any part of Class A, D & E of Part 1 of that Order shall be carried out on site

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the general locality.

17. Notwithstanding the Provisions of Article 4 (1) and part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no satellite antenna shall be erected or installed on any building hereby approved. The proposed

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

development shall have a central dish or aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for 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 prevent the proliferation of satellite dishes on the development

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.

INFORMATIVE: Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

The proposed redevelopment of this site for residential use is considered acceptable as it is compatible with surrounding uses. The siting, design, form, detailing of the residential block and terrace are considered sensitive to its surrounding and character of the area. The proposal will not give rise to significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring. 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).

Section 106: Yes

**PC129.**

**DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Committee considered a report on decisions made under delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the Sub Committee between 19 December 2011 and 29 January 2012.

**RESOLVED**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2012**

	That the content of the report be noted.	
<b>PC130.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  Monday, 12 March 2012.  The meeting closed at 8:55pm.	

COUNCILLOR ALI DEMIRCI

Chair