

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

Councillors: Ahmet (Chair), Akwasi-Ayisi, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Gunes, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Newton, Patterson and Rice

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>
<b>PC61.</b>	<p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Carter for whom Cllr Newton substituted.</p>
<b>PC62.</b>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>Cllr Bevan identified that he had submitted an objection in response to item 12, 814A and B High Road and as such would absent himself as a Committee member for that item in order to make a representation.</p> <p>Cllr Newton identified in relation to item 5, Holly Bank Cottage that he was married to Cllr Engert who was objecting to the application as a local ward Councillor and as such would absent himself as a Committee member for that item.</p> <p>Cllr Rice identified that a number of local residents had approached him at his ward surgery regarding item 7, Holly Bank Cottage but stated that he had not expressed any views that could be construed as pre-determination and therefore would not recuse himself for that item. In addition, item 10, Hampden Lane was located within his ward and as such he had made comments on a previous application for the site which had subsequently been withdrawn and therefore he would absent himself as a Committee member for that item in order to make a representation.</p>
<b>PC63.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 14 July be approved</li> </ul>
<b>PC64.</b>	<p><b>HOLLY BANK COTTAGE, HOLLY BANK, MUSWELL HILL LONDON N10 3TH</b></p> <p>[Cllr Newton absented himself as a member of the Committee for the duration of discussions on this item].</p> <p>The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of existing garages and Holly Bank Cottage on site and redevelopment to provide 6x 2 storey dwellings, car parking and associated landscaping. 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 and subject to a s106 legal agreement.</p> <p>The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. A correction was outlined to point 5.5 within the Committee report in that drainage did constitute a material planning consideration but that officers considered the details provided by the applicant in this regard to be acceptable and noted that Thames Water had made no objection to the application. Three</p>

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

additional representations received since the publication of the agenda were also set out.

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

- The access way to the site was narrow in nature and restricted to less than 3m wide at some points due to overhanging first floor bay windows to the adjacent block of flats and was therefore unsuitable for two way traffic and large delivery vans or refuse vehicles.
- Separation was not proposed between vehicles and pedestrians using the access way giving rise to safety concerns in particular for the residents of Holly Bank flats who utilised the route to access the side gate to their development. This route was the sole access pathway for one of the residents as a wheelchair user and was also used frequently used by parents with pushchairs.
- The development would result in increased traffic using the access way and a change to the hours of use which would cause disturbance to the residents of Holly Bank flats.
- It was proposed that the communal bin store for the new development be located adjacent to the Holly Bank flats which would further narrow the access way and cause a nuisance to residents due to the proximity to their windows.
- The access junction onto Muswell Hill was dangerous.
- Parking pressures in the area would be exacerbated including from the loss of the existing garages.
- The scheme would have a detrimental impact on mature trees on the site, with the design requiring a number to be felled and potentially damaging the roots of those located to the boundary.
- The depth of the basement development works would extend below the water table and could cause future flooding problems.
- Neighbouring properties on Etheldene Avenue would suffer from overlooking from the new houses.
- Development of the site was not opposed but it was considered that this design sought to cram too many properties onto a constrained site.

Members sought clarification from officers on a number of points:

- A response was requested on the issues raised by the objectors on the constrains of the access way. Officers advised that the access way was in general 4.7m in width although it narrowed at a number of points. It was considered acceptable for shared pedestrian and vehicular access in line with the Department for Transport's Manual for Streets and in that it would be fairly low trafficked. Vehicles exiting onto Muswell Hill had a good view of oncoming traffic, with no reported accidents at that junction. Displacement parking from the redevelopment of the site was forecast to be negligible and traffic flow likely reduced from that associated with the current 32 garages on site.
- The impact on adjacent properties on Etheldene Avenue was questioned. Officers outlined that separation distances of at least 20m between the buildings would be maintained and that the roof level of the new dwellings, although slightly higher than the existing garages, would have a lower ridge height than the Etheldene properties.
- Concerns were raised regarding the basement excavation works and the potential impact on the water table. Officers confirmed that a basement

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

impact assessment had been undertaken which demonstrated that due to the relatively shallow excavation depth of 1.5m and presence of mainly London clay, the basement would not have a significant impact on the water table.

- Members expressed dissatisfaction with the low £150k offsite affordable housing contribution. Officers affirmed that the contribution was in line with the affordable housing SPG and that the scheme due to its size did not support onsite provision.

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

- An innovative, sensitive and high quality design had been created for the site to mirror the existing footprint and retain similar building heights.
- The density of development on the site would be relatively low and did not constitute overdevelopment.
- The garages currently on site were underused and as such their demolition would not lead to additional parking pressures in the area.
- The scheme would provide a number of family sized houses which were in demand.
- The current separation distances to adjacent buildings would be maintained and only a slight 1m increase made to the ridge height of the new dwellings.
- The new dwellings had been designed with an internal aspect, with only limited and obscure glazing provided to rear elevations.
- The junction onto Muswell Hill was an existing access way and it was projected that the number of car journeys would be lower than that associated with the garages.
- The proposed bin store was close to the existing store for Holly Bank flats in order to be close to the road junction for ease of servicing.

Cllrs Engert and M. Blake addressed the Committee in their capacity as local ward Councillors and raised the following points:

- Over 250 objections had been received from local residents concerned that the scheme would have an unacceptable impact on the Rookfield Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction Area and would not enhance or preserve its character.
- The scheme would constitute overdevelopment of what was a semi-rural site and would set a precedent for future development in Conservation Areas.
- Access arrangements to the rear of the Holly Bank flats would be affected, including making more dangerous the only route of entry for one of the residents who was a wheelchair user and parents with prams.
- The narrow nature of the access way did not support two way vehicle flow, restricted even further by the siting of the bin stores and the overhanging bay windows.
- Vehicle access onto Muswell Hill was dangerous illustrated in a number of adjacent side roads being blocked off at this end.
- The development of the site was not opposed in general terms but the current scheme was not considered suitable.
- The development would be a full profit scheme and in consideration of the high land value and resale values of the completed units, the affordable housing contribution was too low.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

The legal officer advised the Committee that the Article 4 Direction Area designation was not relevant to the determination of the application and that granting permission would not set a precedent for development in Conservation Areas as individual applications were determined on their own merit.

In response to a request from the Committee, the conservation officer provided further clarification on her position in supporting the application. It was advised that the dilapidated garages currently on site detracted from the Conservation Area and that the design of the proposed scheme was well interpreted within the context of the Conservation Area, of high quality and would constitute better use of the site.

Cllr Bevan put forward a motion to reject the application due to the low s106 contribution. Officers advised that this was unlikely to be upheld on any appeal as the contribution was in line with the Council's current SPD. The motion was not seconded.

Cllr Rice queried whether the application could be rejected on the grounds of the restricted nature of the access way and the lack of separation between vehicles and pedestrians. Officers advised that it would be unlikely that an appeal would be upheld on this grounds due to low volume of traffic using the access way and its compliance with the Manual for Streets. Confirmation was provided that the access way at an average 3m width would accommodate larger vehicles such as delivery lorries.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report to grant permission and which following a vote, the recommendation was lost.

Cllr Bevan put forward a motion to reject the application on the grounds of affordable housing, access and that bedroom 3 to house 6 did not comply with the minimum room size threshold set out within the London Plan. The motion was not seconded.

The Chair put forward a motion, with input from Cllrs Bevan and Carroll, and seconded by Cllrs Mallett and Bevan and which was subsequently carried at a vote and it was

**RESOLVED**

- To reject application HGY/2013/2606 on the grounds of conservation in that the application was out of keeping with the Conservation Area, the level of the affordable housing contribution, access difficulties to the site and the failure for all rooms in the properties to comply with minimum room size standards.

**PC65. 5 BRUCE GROVE, LONDON N17 6RA**

[Cllr Newton returned to sitting on the Committee]

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of side and rear extensions, conversion of part ground, first and second floors into four flats and the erection of 10 houses at the rear of the site. The report set out details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

and human rights implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions and subject to a s106 legal agreement.

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The Committee's attention was drawn to a tabled addendum report setting out three additional conditions.

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

- It was requested that determination of the application be deferred until a further site visit could be undertaken to the billiard (or pool) room in the listed building which had not been possible at the previous visit. It was considered that the room should not be demolished to permit access to the development as although located in one of the extensions, the room was part of the historic character of the building. English Heritage had indicated that they would revisit their assessment of the room given the opportunity for further access. The application failed to consider alternative access routes in order to preserve this room.
- The application was not comprehensive and constituted a cramped, opportunistic design that didn't do justice to the site.
- Access from the upper floor units directly onto the access road to the rear units would be dangerous for pedestrians.
- The development would exacerbate congestion in the area by generating additional access points exiting onto Bruce Grove, a busy red route area.
- There was agreement that the listed building required renovation but that the design proposed under the application was not good enough.
- The noise assessment undertaken for the Conservative Club had been undertaken outside of the football season which was when the bulk of events were held and was therefore misleading.
- No details of the representation from TfL had been included within the agenda pack.

Members sought clarification regarding the standing of the billiard room. The conservation officer confirmed that she had visited the room and was unaware of the assertion that English Heritage would revisit their representation should access be granted. It was considered that the ancillary extension which contained the billiard room made limited contribution to the Listed Building and therefore demolition was considered acceptable.

Elucidation was sought on whether a representation had been received from TfL following conflicting detail within the report. The transport team identified that they did not have any concerns with the scheme following their assessment of the application and confirmed that no representation had been received from TfL. The access road complied with the Manual for Streets and would permit access by emergency vehicles.

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

- The scheme would help to deliver new homes and regenerate the area as well as restore a listed building and utilise redundant land to the rear.
- The removal of the extensions would not cause harm to the listed building.
- Parking would be provided onsite only for the family size units.
- The design proposed was high quality and fairly low density.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

- The applicant had consulted TfL on 5 June and who had raised no objection to the application.
- The acoustic assessment identified the need for improvements to sound insulation and which would comply with the standards imposed for residential properties located above licensed premises.

Cllr Ejiiofor addressed the Committee as a local ward Councillor and raised the following points:

- The floors above the Conservative Club were not currently in residential use.
- The scheme would constitute overdevelopment of the site, resulting in a very narrow access road.
- Access onto Bruce Grove would be unsafe including vehicles having to traverse the pavement.
- The scheme should be rejected on the grounds of unsafe access, lack of compliance with space standards, lack of affordable housing provision and concerns regarding fire vehicle access.
- Although development was needed of the site, this application was not appropriate.

The Chair put forward a motion to defer the application due to uncertainty on the submission of a representation from TfL and concerns over traffic access in a busy red route area and as such whether the development should be car free.

Clarification could also be sought as to whether English Heritage would reassess the application. Cllr Rice requested a second site visit before the rehearing and that if possible the applicant try to clear debris from the site to allow Members to see the building more clearly. The motion was carried at a vote and it was

**RESOLVED**

- To defer application HGY/2014/1041 to a future meeting.

**PC66. 5 BRUCE GROVE, LONDON N17 6RA**

In line with the decision to defer the previous item seeking planning permission for the site, the Listed Building consent application was also deferred.

**PC67. 48-58 HAMPDEN LANE, LONDON N17 0AS**

[Cllr Rice absented himself as a member of the Committee for the duration of discussions on this item]

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the extension of the existing residential two storey flat development by adding a third storey to create 2 x2 bed flats and refurbishment works to the front of the building. 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.

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The Committee's attention was drawn to a tabled addendum report setting out details of a schedule of proposed works submitted by the applicant and an additional condition.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

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

- There were already existing concerns regarding the structural stability of the building, with a number of flats in the block suffering from cracked ceilings, raising the risk that the new floor would worsen this issue.
- The additional flats would result in increased vehicle movements causing access problems to the site and add to existing parking pressures in the area.
- Arrangements had not been outlined for additional refuse storage for the new units or for the future of the communal aerial system.
- The design proposed was ugly and would devalue existing flats.
- The additional storey would block light to the building opposite.
- The proposed new gate would be directly in front of flat 58.

Officers acknowledge that the issue relating to the refuse bins and storage needed to be resolved and as such was covered by condition. Any structural issues with the building during the construction works would fall within the remit of the Building Control department and would require resolution before works could be signed off.

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

- The scheme would provide additional residential units which were in demand.
- Works would be undertaken to modernise the existing block through the installation of cladding to the front façade, new windows to the rear and new garden fencing and gating.
- The new roof would be in line with other properties on the road.
- Plans for the refuse area would be revisited in order to seek to house all the bins from the development.
- A structural survey would be undertaken before works commenced.
- Construction works would be limited to weekdays only.

Cllr Rice addressed the Committee as a local ward Councillor and raised the following points:

- The windows to the additional flats would result in overlooking to the building opposite.
- Parking pressures were already significant in the area and would be exacerbated by the additional units.
- The block was in poor condition and required total redevelopment and not an additional floor.

The Committee sought clarification as to whether an additional condition could be imposed covering the refurbishment of the block. Officers advised that the additional condition contained within the addendum report required improvement works to the existing building to be implemented prior to the occupation of the flats. This condition could be amended however to require a schedule for these works to be approved prior to the development starting.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including a condition requiring approval of the schedule of works of improvement prior to the start of the development works and it was

**RESOLVED**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

- That planning application HGY/2014/1000 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. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no development shall take place until precise details of the external materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted be submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and retained as such in perpetuity.  
Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area and consistent with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
  4. Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted, all flank wall windows (north and south elevations) shall be fitted with obscured glazing and any part of the window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be non-opening and fixed shut. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.  
Reason: To avoid overlooking into the adjoining properties and to comply with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 General Principles of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
  5. The dwelling(s) hereby approved shall achieve Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. No dwelling shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that Code Level 4 has been achieved.  
Reasons: To ensure that the development achieves a high level of sustainability in accordance with Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Policies SP0 and SP4 the Haringey Local Plan 2013.
  6. 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 the building hereby approved. The proposed 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



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

development.

7. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.  
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties
8. No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.  
Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality and to comply with Saved Policy UD7 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2011.
9. No development shall take place until details of the type and location of secure and covered cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until a minimum of 2 cycle parking spaces for users of the development, have been installed in accordance with the approved details. Such spaces shall be retained thereafter for this use only.  
Reason: To promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies 6.1 and 6.9 of the London Plan 2011 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.

INFORMATIVE 1: 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.

INFORMATIVE 2: With regards to surface water drainage, it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water course, or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water, it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777

INFORMATIVE 3: 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 4: The site will require managing agents to have a cleansing schedule to remove litter from the external areas of the site and cleansing of the waste storage areas. A clear instruction from the managing agents to residents of how and where to dispose of waste responsibly is recommended. The Crime

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 2014**

	<p>Prevention Department of Haringey Police can provide all aspects of security advice as required. We can be contacted on 020 8345 2167.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE 5: Community Infrastructure Levy. The application is advised that the proposed development will be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL. Based on the Mayor's CIL charging schedule and the information given on the plans, the charge will be £6,755.00 (193sqm x £35). This will be collected by Haringey after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>PC68.</b>	<p><b>35-39 THE BROADWAY, LONDON N8 8DU</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC69.</b>	<p><b>814 A AND B HIGH ROAD, LONDON N17 0DH</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC70.</b>	<p><b>2A TALBOT ROAD, LONDON N15 4DH</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC71.</b>	<p><b>10 ALEXANDRA HOUSE, STATION ROAD, LONDON N22 7TR</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC72.</b>	<p><b>APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC73.</b>	<p><b>UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>Due to time constraints, this item was deferred.</p>
<b>PC74.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>A Special Planning Committee is scheduled for 30 September to consider the applications deferred from this meeting.</p>

COUNCILLOR AHMET  
Chair