

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

Councillors: Basu, Beacham, Demirci (Chair), Mallett (Vice-Chair), McNamara, Reid, Reith, Rice, Solomon and Strang

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION
PC44.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>The Chair identified that Bounds Green ward councillors, of which he was one, had submitted a consultation response to item 7: works to dangerous trees on Pinkham Way. Cllr Mallett would therefore take over the Chair for the duration of that item, with Cllr Demirci taking no part in determining the aforementioned application.</p>
PC45.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the minutes of the special Planning Committee on 27 June and the Planning Committee on 8 July be approved and signed by the Chair.
PC46.	<p>LAND ADJACENT TO 72 LANGDON PARK ROAD AND PUBLIC TRIANGLE, MILTON PARK N6 5PZ</p> <p>The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the land adjacent to 72 Langdon Park Road and the Public Triangle on Milton Park N6 for the provision of a glass reinforced plastic (GRP) control kiosk enclosure and low level carbon filter ventilation stack. The report set out details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions.</p> <p>The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The specified external equipment was required in order to protect wider pumping station control equipment to be installed underground. A pumping station was needed in the area to improve drainage conditions and mitigate flooding caused by storm events to a number of properties in Langdon Park Road.</p> <p>The officer advised the Committee of a proposed amendment to the wording of condition 10 relating to landscaping in recognition that the applicant had submitted a landscaping plan in advance of determination of the application as opposed to submitting to the Council for approval at a later date as stated in the original wording.</p> <p>The officer advised of an error in the committee report. The last two sentences of Paragraph 9.5.9 should read as follows: 'Although the concentrations could be slightly higher closer to the vent than at the receptor 5m from the vent, it would still be unlikely to be detectable to the public. As such, it is highly unlikely that any malodorous odours could be detected in the vicinity of the low level vent stack from the adjoining properties or parking spaces.'</p>

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

A number of objectors addressed the Committee and raised the following points, supported by a supplementary document circulated with the permission of the Chair:

- The Committee's attention was drawn to reported evidence of the failure level of pumping stations across the UK and details of the impact of subsequent ecological damage and nuisance caused to local people.
- The specified external equipment would be out of keeping with existing street furniture in the local Conservation Area, with the kiosk in particular a considerable size and significantly larger than standard electric or telecom kiosks.
- Concerns were raised over the risk of odour emissions from the short vent stack proposed.
- The siting of the equipment was out of line with DEFRA guidance, particularly the proximity to nearby properties.
- It was considered that the applicant had not given sufficient consideration to alternative, more permanent solutions to mitigate the flooding issues in the area, with the current solution appearing to constitute a temporary fix.

Officers clarified that the application solely covered installation of the GRP control kiosk enclosure and low level vent, with the underground pumping station equipment constructed under permitted development rights. Therefore the functionality of the wider pumping station equipment which was not subject to planning permission was outside of the scope of consideration for the application.

A representative for the applicant, Thames Water, addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- The equipment installation proposed under the application, in conjunction with the underground pumping station, would constitute a permanent solution to the serious flooding issues affecting a number of properties in the area.
- Expert reports had been commissioned on potential odour and noise issues associated with the equipment and which identified that any impact would be within acceptable thresholds.
- The applicant had agreed to six monthly maintenance checks of the carbon filtered ventilation stack.
- In response to the concerns raised by the objectors regarding the failure rate of pumping station equipment, the backup safety features to the underground equipment were outlined including warning system, secondary pump, overflow capacity etc.
- As part of the application, the Milton Road triangle would be improved through a new planting scheme.
- In response to a question, confirmation was provided that Thames Water had considered alternative options through a feasibility study to address the flooding issues in the area. The option contained within the report including the location selected for the equipment siting, had been considered to be the most appropriate technically and in terms of value for money considerations.

A resident addressed the Committee in support of the application and raised the following points;

- The resident lived in one of the properties on Langdon Park Road at risk from the flooding problems in the area and explained the impact of previous

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

flooding events involving raw sewage flooding into the ground floor of the property, causing a significant health hazard and requiring an extensive clean up operation. The risk of future flooding events was a subject of considerable ongoing stress for residents affected.

- The current solution proposed by Thames Water appeared to be reasonable and appropriate to remedy the flooding problem in the area.
- The assurances provided in terms of negligible odour and noise impact from the kiosk and vent stack were accepted.

In response to a question regarding the size of the proposed kiosk, with some variance apparent between the mock ups provided by the objectors and the applicant, the applicant's representative confirmed that those provided within the report had been professionally drawn to scale to be an accurate reflection.

The Committee requested that the condition requiring six monthly maintenance checks of the carbon filtered ventilation stack and subsequent reporting to the Council be extended to impose the same maintenance requirements on any future operator of the equipment should ownership be transferred from Thames Water at any point.

It was also requested that an informative be added for the applicant to consult local residents in the choice of paint colour selected for the GRP control kiosk enclosure and ventilation stack.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the amended conditions covering maintenance checks and landscaping and additional informative above and it was

RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2013/0662 be approved subject to conditions:
 1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.
Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.
 2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
 3. The GRP control kiosk enclosure and low level ventilation stack forming part of the development hereby approved shall be painted black and retained thereafter in perpetuity.
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 conservation area consistent with Policies 7.5 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

Plan: Strategic Policies 2013.

4. Where noise emitted from any mechanical plant or machinery within the development hereby approved, the 'A' weighted sound pressure level from the plant and machinery (including non-emergency auxiliary plant and generators) hereby permitted, when operating at its noisiest, shall not at any time exceed a value of 10 dB below the minimum external background noise, at a point 1 metre outside any window of any residential property, unless and until a fixed maximum noise level is approved by the Local Planning Authority. The background level should be expressed in terms of the lowest LA90, 15 mins during the proposed hours of operation. The plant-specific noise level should be expressed as LAeqTm, and shall be representative of the plant operating at its maximum.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013)

5. The 'GRP control kiosk enclosure and Sewerage Pumping System (SPS)' hereby approved shall not transmit vibration to adjoining or other premises or structures that would cause a vibration dose value of greater than 0.4 m/s (1.75) 16 hour day-time nor 0.23 m/s (1.75) 8 hour night-time as defined by BS 6472 (2008) in any part of a residential property.

Reason: To ensure that the development is designed to prevent structural transmission of noise or vibration and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013)

6. The GRP hereby permitted shall not, when operating at its noisiest, shall not at any time exceed a value of 10 dB below the minimum external background noise, at a point 1 metre outside any window of any residential property, unless and until a fixed maximum noise level is approved by the Local Planning Authority. The background level should be expressed in terms of the lowest LA90, 15 mins during the proposed hours of operation. The GRP noise level should be expressed as LAeqTm, and shall be representative of the GRP operating at its maximum.

Reason: To ensure that the development is designed to prevent structural transmission of noise or vibration and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013)

7. The SPS pumps hereby permitted shall be installed on 'Anti-Vibration mountings'

Reason: To ensure that the development is designed to prevent structural transmission of noise or vibration and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013)

8. The carbon filter of the low level ventilation stack hereby approved shall be inspected one month after commissioning, and thereafter inspected and maintained every six months.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013).

9. The applicant is required to provide the Local Planning Authority with written confirmation of the outcome of each six-monthly inspection and maintenance assessment.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers and in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies UD3 and ENV6 and ENV7 of Unitary Development Plan (post Local Plan Adoption 2013).

10. No development shall take place until full details of soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. Soft landscape works shall include (planting plans, written specifications - including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, and implementation programme and thereafter retained in perpetuity.

Reason: In order to provide a suitable setting for the proposed development in the interest of visual amenity and the appearance of the conservation area consistent with Policies 7.5 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013.

Informatives:

A. The applicant is required to provide the Local Planning Authority and local residents with an emergency contact number, for reporting malodorous emissions, giving rise to complaints of nuisance.

B. In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. As with all applicants, we have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies, and all other Council guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, so as to ensure the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.

Please note that the conditions referred to in the minutes are those as originally proposed in the officer's report to the Sub-Committee; any amended wording, additional conditions, deletions or informatives agreed by the Sub-Committee and recorded in the minuted resolution, will, in accordance with the Sub-Committee's decision, be incorporated into the Planning Permission as subsequently issued.

PC47. PINKHAM WAY N11 3PW

[Cllr Mallett in the Chair].

The Committee considered a report on the application to undertake works to dangerous trees on the site boundary of Pinkham Way N11. The report set out

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report which was seeking permission to undertake work to trees and branches on the boundaries of the site determined as posing a public safety risk, including potential hazard to nearby sections of highway and the railway network. The proposed schedule of works incorporated a number of remedial measures including felling, pollarding and crown reduction to those trees considered to be in a dangerous condition. Assurances had been provided by the applicant that the works proposed were not intended to clear the site of trees and were not connected with any future redevelopment of the site.

Confirmation was provided by the Planning Officer that a condition requiring the applicant to undertake a bat inspection prior to any works being carried out was proposed.

A number of objectors addressed the Committee with regard to the application and raised the following points:

- Significant concerns were expressed on the negative impact the proposed works could have on bat habitats, with a majority of the trees on site classified as having high potential for bat roosting. It was emphasised that bats and their habitats were highly protected, with stringent associated legislative provisions in place including requirements around the undertaking of bat surveys, which it appeared had yet to be undertaken for the site. A comprehensive survey would allow any bat roosts to be isolated and protected prior to any tree works being undertaken.
- Although the landowners statutory duties to landusers was acknowledged, it was considered that alternative means to secure the dangerous trees should have been explored.

A representative for the applicant, the North London Waste Authority (NLWA), addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The dangerous trees had been identified in a survey following an emergency felling of a number of trees in November 2012. The need was emphasised to carryout works as a matter of urgency to mitigate the risks to public safety and in recognition of the landowner's duty of care to land users.
- Confirmation was provided that the deadwood from the tree works would remain on site.
- The NLWA was in dialogue with Transport for London regarding the logistical considerations in undertaking the works.
- The NLWA had a large, ongoing bat survey running on site.

The Committee queried as to whether any alternative means of risk reduction had been considered for the trees in question such as physical containment measures. The Council's Arboricultural Officer confirmed that a conservative approach had been taken, inline with best practice, in determining the schedule of works, with a focus on the immediate works necessary and predominantly based on pruning. Felling was only proposed for the trees in the worst condition due to significant structural defects.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

The Committee asked that proposed informative covering the retention of deadwood on the site be converted to a condition to make it more binding. It was also requested that the condition requiring the undertaking of a bat inspection prior to the works being undertaken be extended to require this to be carried out in consultation with representatives from Natural England and the Pinkham Way Alliance.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the amended condition covering bat inspection and the additional condition covering the retention of deadwood and it was

RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2013/0847 be approved subject to conditions;
 1. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out only in accordance with the schedule of works and specifications received on 22 August 2013, submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
 2. All works must be undertaken by qualified and experienced tree work contractors and be in accordance with BS 3998:2010 recommendations for tree work and details of the works hereby approved shall be submitted and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first commencement of works. Works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To achieve good arboricultural practice and protect TPO trees on the site.

INFORMATIVES:

Dead wood from the proposed works should be retained in-situ in accordance with wildlife protection best practice.

In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

PC48. 37-39 STANHOPE GARDENS, N6 5TT

[Cllr Demirci back in the Chair. Cllr McNamara was absent from the meeting for the remainder of proceedings]

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for 37-39 Stanhope Gardens N6 for the partial demolition and rebuilding of two storey rear extensions and the formation of rear dormers. The report set out details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights implications and

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

recommended to grant permission subject to conditions. The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. It was identified that the applicant had submitted an indicative landscaping plan for the site.

The Planning Officer set out that new plans had been submitted clarifying the dimensions of the proposal and the relationship to surrounding properties.

The Committee raised the following issues in discussion of the application:

- In response to a question, officers confirmed that construction work had started on site without planning permission and as such had been subject to planning enforcement action.
- Members questioned the impact of the application on the character of the local Conservation Area. On balance, officers considered that the works would enhance the area by virtue of improving the condition of the properties, with the majority of changes concentrated to the rear elevations, leaving the existing front façade relatively unchanged.
- Officers confirmed that the applicant had the ability to extend the properties within certain parameters without requiring permission from the Council under permitted development rights.

A number of objectors addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- Improvements to the condition of both properties were welcomed but it was felt that those proposed did not complement and indeed were out of keeping with the character of the local Conservation Area.
- The proposed first floor balconies would result in a potential loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- The scale of the ground floor extension was of concern, being out of proportion to neighbouring boundaries and not set in, thereby risking causing overshadowing to neighbouring properties.
- The solid wall proposed between the properties was bulky and would reduce light to neighbouring properties.

Cllr Weber addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The bulk and scale of the works proposed was of concern, with potential impact on neighbouring properties in relation to noise, drainage issues, loss of light and privacy
- The design was not sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The works proposed would secure the restoration of both properties and rear gardens from their current neglected state thereby benefiting the local area
- Considerable amendments had been made to the design in light of comments from the Council and local residents in response to a previous application submitted which had subsequently been withdrawn.
- Any trees removed from the rear gardens would be replaced, with a final landscaping plan to be submitted for Council approval.
- The site was located on a bend of the road thereby reducing the impact of the scheme on the local area.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2013/0918 be approved subject to conditions:
 1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

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

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

4. Details of a scheme depicting those areas to be treated by means of hard and soft landscaping to the rear of the two dwellings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme shall include the details of the size, species and location of replacement trees.

Reason: In order to ensure the development has satisfactory landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Class A of Part 2 of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 details of the boundary treatment to separate the gardens of two dwellings and the adjoining gardens (35 and 41 Stanhope Gardens) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the completion of the extensions hereby approved and thereafter implemented in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the general Locality

6. Notwithstanding the approved plans in specific the roof terrace approved, the rest of the roof of the extension hereby permitted shall only be used in connection with the repair and maintenance of the building and shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, terrace, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area without the benefit of the grant of further specific permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

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

INFORMATIVE: In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. As with all applicants, we have made available detailed advice in the form of our

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 9 SEPTEMBER 2013**

	statutory policies, and all other Council guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, so as to ensure the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.
PC49.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING The next scheduled meeting will be on 14 October.

COUNCILLOR ALI DEMIRCI

Chair