Haringey Council

Please note that the Council has amended the protocol with regard to hearing representations at Planning Sub-Committee meetings. Objectors or supporters should advise the Council by noon on the working day immediately prior to the Sub-Committee meeting (for a Monday meeting this would be by noon on the Friday prior to the Sub-Committee) in order to allow appropriate administrative arrangements to be put in place. The number of speakers will usually be limited to two speaking for a proposal and two speaking against the proposal with a time limit of 3 minutes i.e. a maximum of 6 minutes.

Persons interested in addressing the Committee in relation to an application should contact the Committee Secretariat team on 02084891512 by noon the working day prior to the Planning Committee meeting.

Please be advised that speaking slots will be allocated on a strictly first come first served basis. Discretion will remain with the Chair regarding the number of representations permitted at Planning Committee meetings and time allocated outside of the guideline set out above.

Please note that whilst the meeting is open to members of the public, there are no public speaking rights for items 12-14 as preapplication briefings.

## Planning Sub Committee

MONDAY, 1ST JUNE, 2015 at 7.00 pm HRS - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, WOOD GREEN, N22 8LE.

MEMBERS: Councillors Ahmet (Chair), Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Carter, Doron, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Patterson, Ryan and Weston

## AGENDA

## 1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Please note this meeting may be filmed or recorded by the Council for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site or by anyone attending the meeting using any communication method. Although we ask members of the public recording, filming or reporting on the meeting not to include the public seating areas, members of the public attending the meeting should be aware that we cannot guarantee that they will not be filmed or recorded by others attending the meeting. Members of the public participating in the meeting (e.g. making deputations, asking questions, making oral protests) should be aware that they are likely to be filmed, recorded or reported on. By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings.

The Chair of the meeting has the discretion to terminate or suspend filming or recording, if in his or her opinion continuation of the filming, recording or reporting would disrupt or prejudice the proceedings, infringe the rights of any individual, or may lead to the breach of a legal obligation by the Council.

## 2. APOLOGIES

3. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 17 below.

## 4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

A member with a disclosable pecuniary interest or a prejudicial interest in a matter who attends a meeting of the authority at which the matter is considered:
(i) must disclose the interest at the start of the meeting or when the interest becomes apparent, and
(ii) may not participate in any discussion or vote on the matter and must withdraw from the meeting room.
A member who discloses at a meeting a disclosable pecuniary interest which is not registered in the Register of Members' Interests or the subject of a pending notification must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days of the disclosure.
Disclosable pecuniary interests, personal interests and prejudicial interests are defined at Paragraphs 5-7 and Appendix A of the Members' Code of Conduct

## 5. DEPUTATIONSIPETITIONS

To consider receiving deputations and/or petitions in accordance with Part Four, Section B, Paragraph 29 of the Council's Constitution.

## 6. MINUTES (PAGES 1-54)

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 5 March, 10 March, 16 March and 25 March.

## 7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

In accordance with the Sub Committee's protocol for hearing representations; when the recommendation is to grant planning permission, two objectors may be given up to 6 minutes (divided between them) to make representations. Where the recommendation is to refuse planning permission, the applicant and supporters will be allowed to address the Committee. For items considered previously by the Committee and deferred, where the recommendation is to grant permission, one objector may be given up to 3 minutes to make representations.
8. SITE TO REAR OF 38 THE BROADWAY N8 9SU (PAGES 55-82)

Construction of single storey temporary cafe / restaurant on a vacant site accessed from The Broadway via Rose Place, formed from four recycled shipping containers, including parking for two cars, bicycle storage and refuse and recycling storage.

RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.
9. THAMES WATER LAND OFF WOODSIDE AVENUE N10 3JA (PAGES 83-106)

Change of use of land to horticultural use related to an existing educational establishment. Construction of 12 planting beds, 1 shed and two polytunnels which will be capable of being moved around the site. Erection of a 1.8 m fence with access from the existing footpath and management of trees located on the site including those subject to Tree Preservation Orders. (AMENDED PLANS).

RECOMMENDATION: grant permission subject to conditions.
10. STROUD GREEN PRIMARY SCHOOL WOODSTOCK ROAD N4 3EX (PAGES 107- 120)Installation of gas fired condensing boilers complete with new stainless steel flue andscreening (Planning Application)
Listed Building consent for installation of gas fired condensing boilers complete with new stainless steel flue and screening (Listed Building Application).
RECOMMENDATION: grant planning permission subject to condition and grant Listed Building consent subject to conditions.

## 11. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

Items 12-14 are pre-application presentations to the Planning Sub-Committee and discussion of proposals.
Notwithstanding that this is a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no decisions will be taken on these items and any subsequent applications will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with standard procedures.
The provisions of the Localism Act 2011 specifically provide that a councillor should not be regarded as having a closed mind simply because they previously did or said something that, directly or indirectly, indicated what view they might take in relation to any particular matter. Pre-application briefings provide the opportunity for Members to raise queries and identify any concerns about proposals.
The Members' Code of Conduct and the Planning Protocol 2014 continue to apply for pre-application meeting proposals even though Members will not be exercising the statutory function of determining an application. Members should nevertheless ensure that they are not seen to pre-determine or close their mind to any such proposal otherwise they will be precluded from participating in determining the application or leave any decision in which they have subsequently participated open to challenge.

## 12. 191-201 ARCHWAY ROAD, LONDON N6 5BN (PAGES 121-134)

13. 255 LORDSHIP LANE, N17 (PAGES 135-140)
14. BEACON LODGE, 35 EASTERN ROAD, LONDON N2 (PAGES 141-148)
15. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 149 -
230) 

To advise of decisions taken under delegated powers between 1 March and 30 April 2015.
16. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 231-244)

To advise of major proposals in the pipeline including those awaiting the issue of the decision notice following a committee resolution and subsequent signature of the section 106 agreement; applications submitted and awaiting determination; and proposals being discussed at the pre-application stage.

## 17. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

To consider any items admitted at item 2 above.
18. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Special Planning Committee 22 June.

Bernie Ryan
Assistant Director - Corporate Governance and Monitoring Officer
Level 5
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Maria Fletcher
Principal Committee Coordinator
Level 5
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Tel: 02084891512
Email: maria.fletcher@haringey.gov.uk
Thursday, 21 May 2015

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

## MINUTE

## SUBJECT/DECISION

NO.

| PC25. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST <br> Cllr Carter identified in relation to item 7, Sheldon Avenue that he had been <br> approached by the applicant and an objector in his role as a local ward councillor. <br> The Chair agreed to vary the order of the agenda to consider items 8 and 9 first. <br> Cllr Gunes arrived late to the meeting and as such did not take part in the <br> determination of item 8, Anderton Court. |
| :--- | :--- |
| PC26. | 9 RAILWAY ARCHES ST JAMES'S LANE N10 3QX <br> The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission <br> for the demolition of existing workshop building and construction of an office and <br> workshop building underneath the viaduct arch number 9. The report set out details <br> of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning <br> policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights <br> implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions. |

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The attention of the Committee was drawn to a tabled addendum setting out an amendment to condition 3 which current outlined restrictions on the hours of operation of the unit. Following an investigation, a revised condition was proposed requiring written Council approval of the means of ventilation for the unit including odour control and noise levels in order to safeguard the amenity of adjoining properties.

An objector addressed the Committee and raised the following points regarding the application:

- The arches had suffered from mismanagement over the years
- No precedent was in place for a food production business in the area
- Concerns were expressed that the proposed business would be able to operate on a Sunday and bank holidays, causing a nuisance to surrounding residential areas.

The applicant briefly addressed the Committee and outlined that the granting of the application would allow the expansion of their cupcake business and provided assurance that the business would not be run on Sundays.

The Committee sought clarification on the situation regarding the imposition on restrictions on Sunday and bank holiday hours of use as proposed by the objector and agreed by the applicant, and whether this could be formalised through a condition. Officers advised that currently the unit had no operating hour restrictions imposed under the planning regime but did under the terms of the lease which

## Page 2 <br> MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE <br> THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 2015

wasn't a material planning consideration and which fell under separate legislative provisions for enforcement. The Committee were advised that the imposition of this additional condition could not be justified with regard to the meeting of the statutory tests for the imposition of conditions. Officers considered that the proposed revision to condition 3 was justified, met the statutory test and would address the main grounds of objection to the application covering concerns about noise and odour nuisance.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3410 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 use hereby permitted shall not be operated before 10:00 hours or after 21:00 hours Monday to Friday, before 09:00 hours or after 21:00 hours Saturdays and before 09:00 hours or after 17:00 hours Sundays and Bank Holidays.
Reason: This permission is given to facilitate the beneficial use of the premises whilst ensuring that the amenities of adjacent residential properties are not diminished consistent with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

## INFORMATIVES

Informative: Hours of Construction
The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am-1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.


## Informative: Waste

The applicant is advised that Commercial Business must ensure all waste produced on site are disposed of responsibly under their duty of care within Environmental Protection Act 1990. It is for the business to arrange a properly documented process for waste collection from a licensed contractor of their choice. Documentation must be kept by the business and be produced on request of an authorised Council Official under section 34 of the Act. Failure to do so may result
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| in a fixed penalty fine or prosecution through the criminal Court system. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Waste must be properly contained to avoid spillage, side waste and windblown |
| litter. Waste collection arrangements must be frequent enough to avoid spillage |
| and waste accumulations around the bin area and surrounding land both private |
| and public. |
| Informative: Thames Water |
| The applicant is advised that there is a Thames Water main crossing the |
| development site which may/will need to be diverted at the Developer's cost, or |
| necessitate amendments to the proposed development design so that the |
| aforementioned main can be retained. Unrestricted access must be available at all |
| times for maintenance and repair. Please contact Thames Water Developer |
| Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: 0800 009 3921 for further information. |

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3402 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 external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.
Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London
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Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

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.

## PC28. 22 SHELDON AVENUE N6 4JT

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the retention of all parts of the as-built property, comprising the extended house (excluding north side dormer), pool house and the associated landscaping in the front and rear gardens; elements of which are not in accordance with the approved documents of planning permission HGY/2012/0884; together with the installation of 2 proposed air conditioning units (householder application). 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 setting out additional representations received and minor changes to the wording of conditions and informatives. It was advised that planning permission for the scheme was granted in 2012 but a subsequent application was required for small changes made to the form of the built scheme.

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

- Concerns were raised that the air conditioning unit to the pool house appeared to exceed the level of the abutting fence to the neighbouring property. The applicant confirmed that the position of the unit had been lowered to below fence level and that a post installation noise assessment was required under condition. It was also noted that the hours of operation were limited under condition.
- Clarification was sought from the applicant on the reasons behind the planning enforcement breaches from non-compliance with the original permission. The applicant's representative advised that they had only been engaged post construction but that the problem appeared to have been due to inaccurate drawings hence the need for a retrospective second application.
- It was questioned whether alternative locations for the pool house air conditioner unit had been considered. The applicant's representative confirmed that other locations had been looked at but the current location was the farthest away from neighbouring properties whilst being hidden from view.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3567 be approved subject to conditions.
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1) Within 6 months of the permission hereby approved a post installation noise assessment shall be carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to confirm compliance with the noise criteria outlined in the noise report submitted with any additional steps necessary to mitigate such noise outlined including details of night-time quiet mode settings. The post installation noise assessment/ measures shall ensure that the external noise level emitted from plant equipment will be lower than the lowest existing background noise level by at least 10 dBA , as assessed according to BS4142:1997 at the nearest and/or most affected noise sensitive premises, with all machinery operating together at maximum capacity. The approved details thereafter shall be implemented within 3 months of the approval of such detail and permanently retained and maintained. Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers consistent with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006
2) The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.
3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development otherwise permitted by any part of Class A, B, D \& E of Part 1 to Schedule 2 of that Order shall be carried out on site.

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

## PC29.

ANDERTON COURT ALEXANDRA PARK ROAD N22 7BE
The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of existing garages and construction of 5 new dwelling units. 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 attention of the Committee was drawn to a tabled addendum setting out a minor correction to the report, amended wording to condition 2 and details of further representations received.

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

- At the closest point, the separation distance to number 278 Alexandra Park Road was only 8 m resulting in a loss of privacy, overlooking from windows and terraces and overshadowing, including a significant loss of sunlight to existing solar panels.
- The attention of the Committee was drawn to a tabled representation from
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Keystone Law on behalf of a number of the objectors and which was circulated to the Committee.

- 52 objections had been submitted in response to the application, although it was felt that the breadth and strength of feeling weren't accurately captured within the report.
- Potential damage would be caused to the mature oak tree to the front of the site.
- The development would have a negative and adverse impact on surrounding area.
- The adjacent entrance to Alexandra Park was used regularly by local people and would become overlooked and overshadowed due to the scheme and wouldn't enhance the Park.
- The design contravened GLA and Council standards and had received negative comments from the Haringey Design Panel.
- The scheme would remove the turning space for emergency vehicles contrary to Building Regulations.
- The new units would have inadequate outside space as well as taking away open space currently used by existing residents.
- Overlooking to Anderton Court would be intrusive including to the windows of habitable rooms.
- No noise report had been submitted.
- It was considered that although the need for additional housing in the borough was recognised, the scheme would contribute to this at the expense of current residents.

CIIr Strickland addressed the Committee as the Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration as well as a representative for the applicant and raised the following points:

- The scheme would contribute to providing additional affordable housing stock within the borough and include units set at Council affordable social rent level as well as a number of larger family size properties.
- Accommodation provided would be high quality, spacious and meet Lifetime Homes and Code for Sustainable Homes level 4.
- The scheme aimed to strike a balance between addressing the concerns raised by neighbours and the provision of new affordable homes.
- With regards to the Design Review Panel comments referred to by the objectors, it was advised that changes had been made to the design as a result of the review process to address the concerns raised.
- The units would all exceed required internal and external space standards.
- Windows would be screened or oblique where there was a concern about overlooking, with screening also provided to the terraces.
- A root protection zone would be in place to protect the oak tree under condition to prevent damage
- The scheme was compliant with BRE guidelines relating to sunlight and daylight.
[19.25 - Cllr Gunes enters the meeting]
The Committee raised the following points in their discussion of the application:
- Clarification was sought on the potential loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties raised by the objectors. The applicant advised that the sunlight
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and daylight report had identified a reduction in sunlight but not to below BRE thresholds.

- Further information was sought on the 8 m separation distances to neighbouring properties. The applicant advised that windows to the new units within this zone would be oblique or with no direct sightlines. Officers identified that windows to the rear elevation of the new block at first and second floor level would face over the gardens of the adjoining property and there was scope for overlooking to adjoining properties. The canopies to the trees onsite would provide some degree of mitigation. It was advised that the separation distances would not automatically render the scheme unacceptable but that a balanced view was required over the impact on neighbours and the achievement of policy objectives.
- Clarification was sought on changes made to the application post the design review panel process. It was advised that changes included those to the façade, window treatment and removal of split level terraces.
- The Committee sought advice on the acceptability of the two conditions proposed within the Keystone Law letter. Officers advised that condition one covering 2 m obscure glazing to the roof terraces of the three houses should be negated by the 1.7 m parapet wall, which if found inadequate could be enhanced with an additional 30 cm screen. Condition two covering translucent glazing to first floor east facing windows of the three houses would likely be deemed unlawful under the reasonableness test, with obscure glazing not a normal condition for habitable rooms.
- Further clarification was sought on the access to the site for emergency vehicles. Officers advised that the minimum access width test was met and that at present turning space onsite was not a given due to the current car parking area and that it would not be considered unreasonable for vehicles to be required to reverse out.
- Assurances were provided that the amenity space provided met the minimum standard required.
- Clarification was sought on the impact of the scheme on local on-street parking pressure from the loss of the current car parking area. Officers provided information on the survey methodology applied and which had identified sufficient on-street parking capacity in the wider immediate area to absorb the loss of 15 spaces. A consultation was also underway on potentially extending the current CPZ in the area.

Cllr Beacham moved to add an additional condition consisting of condition 1 proposed within the Keystone Law letter to provide opaque barriers to roof terraces of the three houses to at least 2 m high. Officers proposed instead to add an additional condition covering the three houses that provides for an opaque barrier to a height not less than 2 m from the floor level of the roof terrace be constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to the Council and retained thereafter. Cllr Beacham moved to add this revised additional condition which was seconded by Cllr Carter.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the additional condition covering opaque barriers to the three houses outlined above and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3507 be approved subject to conditions.
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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 following approved plans and specifications:
5429-01-1000 A; 5429-01-1010 A; 5429-01-1100 A; 5429-01-1200 A; 5429-01-1201 A; 5429-01-1250; 5429-01-1260 A; 5429-01-1251; 5429-01-1800; 5429-01-1801; 5429-01-1803; 5429-01-1900;
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. The dwellings 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.
5. 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 development.
6. No development, except for site clearance works, 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 8 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

## Page 9

Policies 6.1 and 6.9 of the London Plan 2011 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.
7. Before 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 in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:-

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- 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 Planning Authority for written approval.
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 in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy ENV1 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

8. 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 in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
9. No works shall be carried out on the site until a detailed report, including risk
assessment, detailing management of demolition and construction dust has been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority (reference to the London Code of Construction Practice) and that the site of contractor company be registered with the considerate constructors scheme. Proof of registration must be sent to the Local Planning Authority prior to any works being carried out on site.
Reasons: To safeguard the amenities of the area consistent with Policies 6.3, 6.11 and 7.15 of the London Plan 2011, Policies SP0 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
10. Prior to the first occupation of the hereby approved four (4no) residential units, installation details of the boiler to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water are to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kWh}$ ( $0 \%$ ). The boilers are to be installed and permanently retained thereafter, or until such time as more efficient technology can replace those previously approved.
Reason: To ensure that the Code for Sustainable Homes assessment obtains all credits available for reducing pollution, as required by the London Plan 2011 Policy 7.14.
11. A residential travel plan must be secured as part of the development and should include the following measures in order maximise the use of public transport:
a) Provision of welcome residential induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables to all new residents, travel pack to be approved by the Council's Transportation Planning team.
b) Establish or operate a car club scheme. The developer must offer free membership to all residents of the development for at least the first 2 years, and provide $£ 50$ (fifty pounds in credit for each member of the car club), evidence of which must be submitted to the Transportation planning team.
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.
12. Prior to commencement, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and implemented accordingly thereafter. The Plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Anderton Court, and Alexandra Road minimised. The construction vehicle movements shall be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.
Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the Transportation network.
13. Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted, the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor flank window in the eastern elevation of the flats hereby permitted 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-
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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.
14. Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved and before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development hereby approved, a Tree Protection method statement incorporating a solid barrier protecting the stem of the trees and hand dug excavations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out as approved and the protection shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.
Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees adjacent to the site during constructional works that are to remain after works are completed consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

## Informatives:

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 08458502777.

INFORMATIVE 3: Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minum pressure of 10 m 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.

INFORMATIVE 4: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 0208489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE 5: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that
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under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am-6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am-1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE 5: Asbestos: Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out.

INFORMATIVE 6: Party Wall Act: The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

## PC30. CONNAUGHT LODGE, CONNAUGHT ROAD N4 4NR

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of garages adjacent to Connaught Lodge and erection of part 3 and part 4 storey building comprising 7 flats and associated landscaping works. 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 setting out additional representations received. Confirmation was provided that initial plans for a proposed bungalow to the rear of the site had been removed from the application.

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

- Concerns raised by residents at a meeting on 17 February had not been reflected within the agenda pack and there had been a general lack of communication with Council officers leading to concerns regarding transparency
- The scheme would result in the loss of valuable open space including the playground which was used regularly by local children
- The application would cause problems of overshadowing and overlooking to neighbouring properties impacting on their light and privacy levels
- The scheme would impact on parking problems in the immediate area
- As a Council application, the scheme should be considered on its merits as opposed to its contribution towards new housing targets
- The plot was too small for the size of scheme proposed.

Cllr Strickland addressed the Committee in his capacity as Cabinet Member for Housing and Regeneration as well as a representative for the applicant and raised the following points:
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- The scheme constituted a modest development which would be built to a good standard
- All the units provided would be for social rent, a tenure in high demand in the borough and would include a wheelchair accessible flat
- Significant changes had been made to the application in response to objections raised including removal of the backland bungalow following concerns regarding overdevelopment and a change from a contemporary to more traditional design sensitive to the Conservation Area.
- The Council's commitment to reprovision of the playground currently onsite was reiterated, and to that end two proposals had been drafted for consultation. Sufficient room remained to the rear of the site for amenity space for the new development and a retained area for a playground.

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

- Concerns were raised over lack of privacy from the balconies. Officers advised that a condition could be added to cover balcony treatment.
- In response to concern regarding future discolouration of the white render treatment around the windows, confirmation was provided that this detail would be made of reconstituted stone which was more durable than render.
- Although the scheme would have a centralised satellite system, it was agreed to add a condition removing permitted development rights for satellite dishes.
- A view was raised that the reprovision of the playground should be completed prior to the start of construction of the scheme. In response, officers advised that consultation was required with local residents on the best location for the playground and that a mixed response to reprovision had been received to date. The Legal Officer advised that in exceptional circumstances a Grampian condition could be added to secure the reprovision but that this could delay works and have an impact on the time sensitive grant associated. Cllr Rice moved a motion to add a Grampian condition which was not seconded and so fell.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including additional conditions covering the balcony treatment and removing permitted development rights for satellite dishes and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3508 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 following approved plans and specifications:
Design and Access Statement prepared by ECD Architects Rev A dated January 2015; Overshadowing Report prepared by Melin Consultants Rev A dated 10 May 2015; Daylighting Factor Calculations prepared by Melin Consultants dated 30 May 2014; Transport Note prepared by ttp Consulting
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dated June 2014; Tree Survey and Constraints Plan (drawing no. 56740-CL-

1) prepared by Landscape Planning Ltd; Tree Survey Tables dated 21/10/2014 prepared by Landscape Planning Ltd; Ground Investigation Report prepared by Ground and Water Limited; 5429-03-1000 Rev C; 5429-03-1010 Rev C; 5429-03-1100 Rev D; 5429-03-1101 Rev B; 5429-03-1200 Rev C; 5429-03-1250 Rev C; 5429-03-1251 Rev C; 5429-03-1800 Rev A; 5429-03-1801 Rev A; 5429-03-1900 Rev C
Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
3. Before 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 in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- 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 Planning Authority for written approval.
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.
Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

4. 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.
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Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
5. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on the Connaught Road is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.
Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the Transportation network.
6. The applicant is required to submit an Arboricultural Method Statement including a Tree Protection Plan for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commencing on site. The Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan must detail the proposed tree protection measures and construction works that may impact on trees including:

1. A pre-commencement site meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturist, Council Arboriculturist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees; and
2. Robust protective fencing/ground protection must be installed prior to commencement of construction activities on site and retained until completion. It must be designed and installed as recommended in BS 5837: 2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.
Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
3. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no above ground 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 the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved by 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. No above ground development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials and any structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other
storage units etc).
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; implementation programme). The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed drawings of:
a. Those existing trees to be retained.
b. Those existing trees to be removed.
c. Those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of any above ground development.
Such an approved scheme of planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of three years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter.
Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Local Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy UD3 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.
Reason: 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.

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: Prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identify the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials should be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procedure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out.
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|  | INFORMATIVE 3: Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum <br> pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point <br> where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this <br> minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development. <br> INFORMATIVE 4: The new development will require numbering. The applicant <br> should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development <br> is occupied (tel. O20 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address. <br> INFORMATIVE 5: This type of work will require a Building Regulation application to <br> be made after Planning permission has been granted. Council's Building Control <br> department has been working to expand and improve the services and products it <br> can offer its customers such as warranties, fire engineering, fire risk assessments, <br> structural engineering, party wall surveying, SAP, EPC, SBEM calculations, <br> BREEAM, CfSH calculations, acoustic advice, air pressure testing etc in <br> consultation with the LABC (Local Authority Building Control) and it would be <br> pleased to explain any of the services in more detail if required. |
| :--- | :--- |
| PC31. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING <br> Special Planning Committee 25 March. |

## COUNCILLOR AHMET

Chair
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MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 10 MARCH 2015

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

| MINUTE |
| :--- |
| PO. SUBJECT/DECISION <br> PC01. APOLOGIES <br> There were no apologies for absence. <br> PC02. URGENT BUSINESS <br> There were no items of urgent business. <br> PC03. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST <br> Councillor Gunes stated that she was a ward councillor for the ward in which <br> the site was located and also that she lived very close to the application site, <br> but did not have any pre-determined views regarding the application. <br> Councillor Mallett stated that she lived close to the application site, but did not <br> have any pre-determined views regarding the application. <br> PC04. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS <br> This meeting was scheduled to consider pre-application presentations to the <br> Planning Sub-Committee and discuss proposals related thereto. <br> Notwithstanding that this was a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no <br> decisions were taken at the meeting, and any subsequent applications will be <br> the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in <br> accordance with standard procedures. <br> PC05. APEX HOUSE, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, LONDON, N15 5PQ <br> The Committee provided views on a proposed redevelopment, comprising the <br> demolition of the existing former Council office and erection of new buildings <br> up to 21 storeys in height, providing 152 residential units and 1,182sqm of <br> retail floor space. <br> Neil McClellan, the Case Officer for the application and Tottenham Majors <br> Team Leader, stated that the pre-application briefing document which had <br> been included in the agenda contained a number of errors and omissions, <br> and consequently a corrected version of the briefing was appended to an <br> addendum report that was tabled at the meeting. <br> Councillor Bevan expressed concern that an addendum report, and amended <br> briefing document, had been circulated at the meeting because this did not <br> give couns sufficient time to consider the information provided therein.   |

It was anticipated that the design for the scheme would go before a Development Management Forum in the latter part of May 2015.

Members made the following comments on the scheme:

- It was queried how much consultation had taken place and if more was planned. The applicant said that there had been three focussed public consultations with interest groups, namely the Ward's Corner Conservation Coalition, market traders and ward councillors, and a public consultation on two days. Further consultations would take place later in the week with the market traders, and it was anticipated that in the last week of March that there would be another public consultation at the applicant's studio in N17 where they would give their response to the comments which had been received from councillors at this meeting, from the previous public consultation and from the Design Review Panel.
- There is currently a public lavatory building on the site - is there any intention to re-provide that facility in the new scheme? The applicant said that they were waiting to see what the outcome of public consultation was, because feedback had been mixed as some people were not keen to have them. It also depended largely on what commercial use went back into the proposed development at ground floor level.
- Proposed Cycle Superhighway Route 1 currently passes next to the site at a point where the pavement is currently not as wide as would be desired; has this been taken into account during the design of the scheme? The applicant advised that the proposed development would be pulled-back from the railing which ran along Tottenham High Road so that the width of the pavement would be approximately 15 m wide and this would create sufficient space for the super-cycle highway to come past the site.
- It was queried how much time was left before the planning permission which had been granted for the Ward's Corner site lapsed. The applicant stated that planning permission had been granted in 2012, at which time the section 106 Agreement was signed, and that it was valid for 5 years.
- Concern that the proposed development should be carried out with regard to the adjacent lower-rise properties and consequently a 21 storey building would be very contentious for the site. The applicant said that the adjacent site was not within their ownership; consequently it was their responsibility to demonstrate within the planning submission how a new building on that site could work with and compliment the proposed development for the Apex House site.
- It was queried what factors drove the thinking that a large tower was needed and would be appropriate for the site, rather than a much lower level density scheme, when taking into account that the Ward's Corner site would also have tall buildings on it. The applicant was of the opinion that the site enjoys extraordinary visibility and significance due to its prominent position at the end of the remarkably long viewing corridor provided by Tottenham High Road. Both the length of the High Road and its width, together with the site's adjacency to a
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significant gateway into Tottenham, gave the opportunity for a building of significant scale, and that this had been identified in previous urban studies. The judgement as to what was acceptable and desired in regard to height was the result of a visual analysis which evaluated a number of options. The result was is a building which the applicant felt makes the most of the opportunities of this extraordinary site, but also created a genuine and valuable piece of real-estate. The height evaluation was a consideration which they would continue to look at, and respond to comments and observations on, and they intended to find a datum which people would feel was appropriate and would be comfortable with. The applicant hoped that there would be support for a building of some height on the site.

- The applicant said that in regard to infrastructure, studies had been undertaken looking at the impact in engineering terms for constructing a building of this stature on this site, and that construction would be underwritten by a significant technical evaluation of the construction implications of the site.
- Concern that there would be overlooking of Seacole Court properties, resulting in loss of privacy. The applicant said that overlooking was unlikely to be a problem as the apartments faced towards the road in easterly and westerly directions and consequently there would be no direct overlooking of existing properties in Seacole Court.
- Concern about the proximity of the Victoria Line and the possible impact thereon caused by the design, construction, and associated building costs. It was put to the applicant that any increased costs in building would be passed on to the prospective purchasers, and this raised the issue that people may not be able to afford the affordable housing units in the scheme. The applicant said that $40 \%$ of the current scheme was affordable accommodation, subject to negotiations to be had with Council officers over tenure, but that they were looking at affordable rents and trying to prioritise larger units as well, in the form of 2 and 3 bed, and perhaps 4 bed units. In regard to the affordability of the units, the applicant stated that when constructing a building there was a budget that had to be worked within in order to make sure that the end units were affordable, whether it be for rent or for sale, and that it was something that they were conscious of as they would not want to build something that they would struggle to rent or sell.
- Concern that there should be sufficient provision of affordable housing. The applicant said that details were still to be discussed with Council officers, but in regard to the current scheme approximately $40 \%$ of the accommodation would be of affordable rent housing, which equated to approximately 50 units out of the 150 or so that would be included in the scheme, and that they hoped the Granger Trust could be the housing association that would manage these units.
- It was queried why the applicant did not want to erect a building higher than the twenty-one storeys proposed. The applicant stated that there was an economic rationale behind the number of storeys, in that if buildings were significantly above twenty floors the number of lifts and the challenge of vertical circulation became another order of cost and another order of sophistication. The applicant went on to say that likewise the requirements of the rigidity of the structure as a building also
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becomes more complex in technical terms, so there were economic parameters for residential design in terms of height.

- Concern about the shadow the proposed building would cast, especially in winter months. The applicant stated that the tall building strategy for the site would be augmented by a significant technical evaluation which would include sunlight, daylight and shadows and that there would be a complete presentation of the performance of the preferred option as consultation was carried out to give every confidence that the environmental impact of a tall building on this site had been properly understood and mitigated as they moved towards the preparation of a planning application for the site.
- Concern that the building was too high in relation to the surrounding buildings. The applicant felt that the site enjoyed extraordinary visibility and significance, and was at the end of a long viewing corridor, and that consequently there was an opportunity for a memorable building of significant scale on the site, and that this had been identified in the emerging urban character study which the Council were currently consulting on. Consequently the scheme complied with emerging planning policy.
- Concern that the proposals for the Ward's Corner site indicated that a similar tall building would be erected on that site, resulting in the 'Manhattanisation' of the Seven Sisters area. The applicant stated that the Ward's Corner proposal had some very unique constraints attached to it which drove the design of it. It had four Victoria line tunnels running underneath it and it also had a very restraining right-oflight envelope which meant that there was only a certain quantum of development that could ever get developed on that site. Also, the proposed development for the Ward's Corner site could by no means be classed as a tower as it would be no more than seven storeys at its highest point.
- It was queried if economics were driving the need for having a tall building. The applicant said that in regard to the economics and viability of the proposal, it was not the financial aspects that drove the desire to have a tall building, but the fact that it was an appropriate location to have a tall building and therefore this was an excellent opportunity to deliver a building on a site where the constraints and opportunities backed up this vision.
- It was queried if all the affordable housing would be in the lower block. The applicant stated that the affordable housing provision would be split between the proposed buildings, with the lower seven storey block on Seven Sisters Road being comprised of $100 \%$ affordable housing, and some being in the lower floors of the taller building and the terrace of houses on Stonebridge Road.
- Concern that the affordable element of housing would be evident and obvious, as in some schemes which were not very well designed there were some quite bad examples where, depending on the floor one was on, it was really evident which was the affordable element and which was not. The applicant stated that the intention was very much for tenure blind, and that it was in their interests as both developer and affordable housing provider, and the owner of private development, to keep it as a building that was well managed and well presented. The applicant further stated that it was very rare for the developer of the
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private element of a scheme to also be developing the affordable element of the same scheme and managing them both together. The applicant stated that Granger was a unique business in being able to do this and the reason it had set up its own registered provider for affordable housing was purely that from a management perspective it was a long-term developer, investor and manager in residential property and Granger wanted its buildings to look as good in the future as when they were finished, both in regard to the affordable and private housing elements.

- It was queried what community benefit would be provided in the proposed scheme. The applicant stated that during construction there would be many jobs created on-site for the local community, that an exemplary building would be created with new accommodation which would be available for local people, including a high level of $40 \%$ of affordable housing, that the building would bring about a vast improvement to the public realm, and the potential to make this a place where people could stop and enjoy whatever there was on the ground floor level from a commercial point of view would also benefit the community.
- Does the applicant consider itself to be a business partner of the Council? The applicant stated that they had a partnership agreement with the Council in regard to the Ward's Corner site development, but not the Apex House site development.
- It was queried as to where in the scheme amenity space was going to be provided for families. The applicant stated that there would be two types of amenity space accessible to residents: a landscaped rooftop and the ground-floor courtyard area. The rooftop space would be more private, and which perhaps would be more suitable for older people, rather than children. The ground-floor area was being enlarged to be suitable for a more public and child-friendly space. The applicant also said that there was a landscaped roof-deck accessible to the tenants in the interior of the scheme and that this, along with the ground floor courtyard area, provided amenity to local tenants and that these features provided opportunities for 'greening' the landscape at the heart of the development.
- Concern was expressed that this was not a suitable location for family housing due to the traffic, pollution and lack of amenity space.
- Was the applicant aware of the 'poor door' report recently produced by Mathew Taylor, Chair of the Social Integration Commission, and would the scheme be designed not have separate doors for the social housing so that all the tenure mixes were using similar entrances and that there was consequently a more joined-up community? The applicant stated that they had had some involvement in the discussions on 'poor doors' and that it originally the 'poor door' idea came about from having doors of a lesser quality, and a building of a lesser quality, rather than actually having separate doors. They would discuss with officers about how this issue would be dealt with in the proposed scheme.
- In terms of density, would it not be possible to have two buildings linked together of no more than ten-story height, rather than one building of twenty storeys? The applicant responded that there was an issue of critical distances between adjacent buildings in terms of
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|  | privacy and sunlight issues, and that there was not enough space on <br> the site to meet the statutory requirements for the separation of <br> accommodation to avoid overlooking and loss of daylight and sunlight. <br> - <br> It was queried whether any decision had been made regarding the <br> provision of balconies. The applicant said that they had followed the <br> legal requirements of the London Plan in providing private accessible <br> space for every unit which varied from 5 to 9sqm per flat, and that they <br> had generally tried to enclose these as much as possible because of <br> noise and wind at high levels they should not be open and therefore <br> they were fully enclosed on every side except one. <br> - It was queried that in regard to the planning permission already <br> granted to the Ward's Corner Community Coalition, does the Planning <br> Department take into account when recommending other applications, <br> planning consent given on nearby sites, but not yet executed? The <br> Assistant Director, Planning, stated that the Council was obliged to <br> take this into account, particularly when considering the effects of new <br> development on those buildings. <br> If planning permission was granted for a 21 storey building on this site, <br> would planning officers accept that this would create a dramatically <br> different precedent for future building in the area? The Head of <br> Development Management and Enforcement did not believe that this <br> would be the case as every planning application was considered on its <br> own merits, and also in relation to what the Council's urban <br> characterisation study stated and what the emerging policies coming <br> forward were coming forward in the Area Action Plan. |
| :--- | :--- |
| PC06. | NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS |

The meeting ended at 8.12 pm

## COUNCILLOR AHMET

Chair
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MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 16 MARCH 2015

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

## MINUTE

## SUBJECT/DECISION

NO.

| PC01. | WEBCASTING <br> RESOLVED <br> - That the Chair's announcement regarding the filming of the meeting for live or subsequent broadcast be noted. |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC02. | APOLOGIES <br> Apologies were received from Cllr Patterson for whom Cllr Sahota substituted. |
| PC03. | DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST <br> The Chair identified that an objection to the application had been submitted on behalf of the Tottenham Labour Party. Cllrs Akwasi-Ayisi, Basu, Bevan, Carroll, Gunes, Mallett and Rice individually confirmed their membership of the Tottenham Labour Party but declared that none of them had been party to discussions on the application and/or contributed to the submission of the subsequent objection. <br> One of the objectors to the application alleged that a number of Planning Committee Members had previously expressed views in support of the provision of housing on the St Ann's site. The Legal Officer advised that the Localism Act allowed for Planning Committee Members to hold a view on an application provided they retained an open mind in determining the application based on its merits. It was identified that no Member of the Committee had made a declaration on holding a predetermined view of the application. The objector was advised that any complaints in this regard should be made to the Council's Monitoring Officer. |
| PC04. | MINUTES <br> RESOLVED <br> - That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 16 February be approved. |
| PC05. | ST ANNS GENERAL HOSPITAL, ST ANNS ROAD N15 3TH <br> The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for demolition within a conservation area and construction of residential buildings, conversion of retained buildings and outline applications. 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 |
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subject to a s106 Legal Agreement.
The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The attention of the Committee was drawn to a tabled addendum setting out a number of minor amendments to the report, details of further representations received since the publication of the agenda including submitted petitions, and an additional condition prohibiting the erection of satellite antenna.

Officers outlined to the Committee the rationale behind the hybrid application approach and the underpinning residential enabling development principle of the scheme to secure a capital receipt to facilitate the redevelopment and reprovision of health services onsite. The impact of this approach on the subsequent affordable housing contribution calculated at $14 \%$ was set out.

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

- The application contravened schedule 1 of the Unitary Development Plan and draft Site Allocations Policy awaiting adoption.
- The new residential units would have a significant impact on school place demand in the area.
- The scheme did not comply with the Council's $50 \%$ affordable housing target or the London Plan and was located in an area with an existing shortage of affordable housing for local people including key workers.
- Greater consideration should have been given by the applicant, the Barnet Enfield and Haringey (BEH) Mental Health Trust, to alternative innovative, long terms approaches to secure the future of the site and allow it to be retained as public land for the benefit of the local community such as the construction of new social housing funded by Council borrowing.
- The Trust had presented the sell off of part of the site as the only solution to austerity cuts.
- Sufficient engagement had not been undertaken with the Haringey Needs St Ann's campaign group during the consultation exercise.
- Evidence had not been provided by the Trust to support the basic premise that the site was surplus to requirements.
- The mental health services currently provided onsite had been subject to managed decline and were insufficient to meet current demand.
- There was an under provision of GP services in the wider area and increasing coverage should have been considered as part of the scheme.
- New investment was welcomed for the site but concerns were raised that the scheme would not address the needs of the local community by restricting the proportion of land allocated for health services thereby risking that capacity would be insufficient to meet future demand based on growth projections for London, in particular the number of inpatient beds provided
- The land values used within the viability assessment were questioned, particularly related to concern that NHS land was often undervalued.
- The proposed affordable housing was likely to be unaffordable to the majority of people in the local area at $80 \%$ of market rent. Consideration should be given to the provision of step-down and key worker accommodation on site.
- The public consultation on the application had not been comprehensive enough and did not form part of the statutory consultation.
- The parking spaces allocated for the scheme were insufficient.
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MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 16 MARCH 2015

- No changes appeared to have been made to the application since it was considered at pre-application stage by the Committee in July 2014.
- Mental health services on site had been deliberately run down over recent years with a shift in capacity to Chase Farm Hospital including the loss of an emergency reception centre and were too limited to meet demand as reflected in the borough's poor mental health performance statistics.
- The proximity of a Children's Centre to the proposed entrance onto Hermitage Road was of concern in relation to increased pollution levels from vehicles.
- With new transport improvements such as Crossrail 2 planned for the borough in the future, consideration should have been given to developing the site in its entirety for primary acute healthcare provision to enable it to become a key north London hospital providing additional capacity to the Royal Free and Whittington hospitals.
- The number of wheelchair accessible homes proposed onsite was insufficient.
- Concerns were raised the construction logistics plan was not wide enough in scope to deal with the congestion caused by works to the local area.
- The relationship between the Trust, the Council and the Bridge New Deal for Communities had hindered the consideration of alternative options for the site including the use of NHS loans, Private Finance Initiatives, fundraising, third party providers etc to fund the new health provision on site.
- Public land should serve public needs and once sold, the land would be out of public control forever.

Cllrs B Blake and Ibrahim addressed the Committee and raised the following points regarding the application:

- The improvements proposed to patient care and facilities onsite were welcomed.
- The proposed access routes onto Stanhope and Warwick Gardens would potentially exacerbate existing antisocial behaviour issues in the area.
- The current primary access route to the site was too small, increasing transport pressure at secondary access points.
- The design of the scheme was car dependent and consideration needed to be given to improvements to local transport links to the site.
- The height of proposed buildings adjacent to Warwick Gardens should be matched to existing properties within the Gardens.
- Concerns were raised over the removal of mature trees onsite and importance of ensuring maintenance plans were in place for new landscaping and planting. It was considered that more open access green space should be provided within the scheme.
- The scale of the development was too large.
- Views had been raised by local people that the architectural design of the scheme was uninspiring and that some of the positive impact buildings currently onsite should be retained.
- The scheme should aspire to be carbon neutral.
- Funds released from the sale of the land should be used for patient care.
- A mental health needs assessment was required for the borough to ensure the site would help meet future health needs in the area.
- The $14 \%$ affordable housing contribution did not mitigate the loss of NHS land.
- Concerns were raised that the impact on school place demand in the area had not been properly assessed.

A number of supporters of the application addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The current mental health inpatient wards were not fit for purpose, with shared facilities and limited privacy for service users and reflected a lack of parity of NHS investment compared to that allocated for physical health services.
- The current NHS buildings were not purpose built and therefore did not provide a therapeutic environment for mental health patients.
- No decrease was proposed in the number of inpatient beds provided onsite.
- The scheme would allow for a more inclusive, integrated land use approach.
- Sufficient green space would be maintained onsite.
- The scheme would provide new affordable housing including larger family size units which were in demand in the local area.
- The scheme achieved a good mix between residential development and releasing funds for the vital reprovision of NHS services.
- Consideration should be given to prioritising the allocation of new affordable housing for key workers, vulnerable adults and step-down accommodation.
- The importance was emphasised of ensuring continuity of care for service users during the construction works.

Representatives for the applicant, the BEH Mental Health Trust, addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- Public consultation had been undertaken during the development of the scheme.
- The current configuration of the NHS buildings onsite resulted in over half the floor space being unused, incurring maintenance costs in the region of $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ annually.
- The residential enabling scheme principle behind the application was the only option available to secure the $£ 39 \mathrm{~m}$ required to fund the essential rebuilding of mental health facilities onsite.
- 10 acres of the site would be retained for health service use and which would provide the flexibility for a doubling of service capacity in the future if required. The challenges in forecasting future mental health service demand were outlined.
- The $14 \%$ affordable housing contribution was the maximum feasible to secure the delivery of sufficient funds for the rebuilding of mental health facilities. Should the land sale values exceeded that projected, further funds would be allocated to increase the affordable housing contribution.
- An overwhelming clinical case had been established for the development of the site to provide improved facilities for the most vulnerable patients through the reprovision of the current unfit for purpose buildings and to achieve greater parity of esteem between mental and physical health service investment.

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

- Clarification was sought on the impact of the scheme on school place allocations. Officers advised that Greater London Authority data was used to assess future demand for school places across the borough and which factored in a projected 400 children associated with the redevelopment of the site. A
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surplus of primary school places were projected until 2023 for the planning area including St Ann's and sufficient secondary school places available across the borough to meet demand until 2018.

- The alternative funding options considered for the site were questioned. The applicant confirmed that the feasibility of a range of options had been examined including the assessment of associated costs. The most cost effective approach had been determined as releasing the surplus resources costing circa $£ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ annually in maintenance costs.
- Further assurances were sought on the grounds for the proposed $14 \%$ affordable housing contribution. The applicant acknowledged that this was a compromise associated with the enabling development principle of the scheme to achieve the primary objective of delivering the required health improvements onsite. The affordable housing contribution had been maximised based on viability and a review mechanism included within the s106 Legal Agreement to capture any uplift in development value assessments, to be allocated on a 60:40 ratio split between affordable housing and health provision.
- In response to a question regarding the housing mix proposed onsite, confirmation was provided that a significant proportion of units within the detailed application, and indicatively within the outline permission, would be houses with gardens.
- Assurances were sought over the valuation of the land. It was advised that the Trust had a statutory duty to achieve best value for the site and to this end had engaged professional advisors, auditors and the District Valuer's Office.
- In response to a question regarding potential future changes to the density of development under the outline permission, it was advised that this was covered under condition and that any proposed alteration would require reassessment of the application.
- In response to a question, the Trust confirmed that there were currently no plans to provide step-down housing onsite. A recovery house was provided within the borough, with this type of facility generally not located on hospital sites.
- Concerns were raised over the impact of the scheme on GP provision in the area, identified by a number of the objectors as already being poor. Officers confirmed that the scheme had been discussed with both NHS England and the Haringey Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) as the statutory bodies responsible for health care planning. They identified that there was adequate primary care provision in the area to support the additional residential units and confirmed that the St Ann's site was not required for primary health care. Officers additionally advised that the production of any joint strategic needs assessment document for the borough fell within the remit of NHS England and the Haringey CCG.
- Clarification was sought on conservation elements including changes to the existing brick wall to the front of the site and the water tower. Officers advised that a compromise approach had been reached for the wall to retain in parts and open up with railings in others. The Council's conservation officer had identified that this approach would result in significant harm but overall, officers considered that this harm was balanced by the overall benefits of the scheme including regeneration of the site, the retention of Victorian buildings and security improvements. The water tower would be retained and converted into residential use.
- Assurances were sought over the rationale behind the hybrid application approach. Officers advised that this was a commonly used planning approach
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and enabled greater control through linking delivery of the residential and health elements of the development through the use of phasing conditions. The use of both hybrid and enabling developments had been endorsed by the courts. In response to a question, confirmation was provided that the scheme would take a phased approach, with restrictions placed on the occupation of the residential units linked to progress in construction of the healthcare campus.

- Concerns were raised over the potential road safety impact of the scheme on surrounding schools. Officers advised a road safety audit had been completed which highlighted a number of improvements to be made including enhancing crossings in the area, realigning the roundabout on Blackboy Lane etc. Should the application be approved, further consultation would be undertaken on access to the site. Extensive transport modelling had been undertaken for the site.
- Concerns were raised over the accessibility of the site for pedestrian access. It was advised that although the scheme would provide a relatively high number of parking spaces due to its low public transport accessibility level (PTAL) rating, the site had been carefully modelled to ensure the layout promoted sustainable transport including cycle parking and pedestrian access through Warwick Gardens to transport links on Green Lanes. Traffic calming measures would also be in place within the site.
- Clarification was sought as to whether reserved matters for the outline permission would come back to Committee. It was advised that these were usually discharged under officer delegated authority but would be discussed with the Chair if it was within the wider public interest to go before Committee.
- The $£ 110 k$ s 106 contribution towards Legible London Signage was questioned. It was advised that Transport for London had requested this as part of the wider Tottenham regeneration strategy to promote walking and sustainable transportation.

Cllr Rice put forward a motion to reject the application on the grounds of inadequate health care provision and affordable housing provision and which was subsequently seconded by Cllr Carter. Officers reiterated that the responsible statutory authorities for healthcare planning in the borough were satisfied with the scheme and that the affordable housing position arose as a direct result of the enabling development rationale underpinning the application which allowed for the delivery of improved health services to take primacy over affordable housing provision. The legal officer confirmed that based on the evidence submitted, the Committee would not have a sustainable reason for rejection of the application, an indefensible position which would leave the Council at substantial risk of considerable costs at appeal. Following a vote, the motion fell.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

## RESOLVED

That planning application HGY/2014/1691 be approved comprising of
i) Full application for the demolition of buildings within the conservation area and construction of 106 flats and 7 houses ranging in height from 2 to 5 storeys, conversion of retained buildings to provide 7 houses and 148 sq . m of retail (use class A1), car parking spaces, highway and public realm works, hard and soft landscaping, access and associated development:and:
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ii) Outline application (with all matters reserved except for principal means of access) for the construction of new buildings and conversion of retained buildings ranging in height from 2 to 5 storeys to provide up to 350 residential units, new healthcare buildings, upgrade of existing access point off Hermitage Road, open space and associated development; and
iii) Outline application (with all matters reserved except for scale and layout) for construction of a new mental health inpatient building up to 3 storeys in height (use class C2) and associated development
subject to conditions and subject to a s106 Legal Agreement:

1. The development hereby authorised in the DETAILED permission, as depicted in red on approved plan A-00-002 Rev 1, 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. All applications for the approval of Reserved Matters within the OUTLINE permission, as depicted in blue on approved plan A-00-002 Rev 1, and referenced as Phases H1, H2, R1, R2, R3, and R4, as depicted on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1, shall be made to the Local Planning Authority no later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, and the development hereby authorised must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates, failing which the permission shall be of no effect:
a) The expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
or
b) The expiration of two years from the final date of approval of any of the reserved matters.
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.
3. This permission, which relates to the area depicted in blue on approved plan A-00-002 Rev, is granted in OUTLINE, in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 and before any development is commenced, the approval of the Local Planning Authority shall be obtained to the following reserved matters, namely:
i) In relation to Phases R1, R2, R3, R4, and H2 as depicted on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1:
(a) appearance; (b) landscaping; (c) layout; (d) scale; (e) housing mix Full particulars of these reserved matters, including plans, sections and elevations, all to an appropriate scale, and any other supporting documents indicating details of
B1) the materials to be used on all external surfaces
B2) details of boundary walls, fencing and other means of enclosure
B3) the provision for parking, loading and turning of vehicles within the site
ii) In relation to Phase H1 as depicted on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1
for the provision of the new Mental Health Inpatient Building:

## (a) appearance; (b) landscaping

Full particulars of these reserved matters, including plans, sections and elevations, all to an appropriate scale, and any other supporting documents indicating details of
B1) the materials to be used on all external surfaces
B2) details of boundary walls, fencing and other means of enclosure
B3) the provision for parking, loading and turning of vehicles within the site
shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for the purpose of obtaining their approval, in writing. The development shall then be carried out in complete accordance with those particulars.
Reason: In order to comply with Article 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988 (as amended) which requires the submission to, and approval by, the Local Planning Authority of reserved matters.
4. 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. Those being:
28076-A-01-001 Rev P1; 28076-A-01-002 Rev P1; 28076-A-01-003 Rev P1; 28076-A-01-101 Rev P1; 28076-A-01-102 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-001 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-101 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-102 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-103 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-104 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-105 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-106 Rev P1; 28076-A-02-107 Rev P1; 28076-A-EXT-03-001; 28076-A-EXT-03-002; 28076-A-EXT-03-003; 28076-A-EXT-03-004; 28076-A-CON-03-001; 28076-A-CON-03-002; 28076-A-CON-03-003; 28076-A-CON-03-004; 28076-A-NEW-03-001; 28076-A-NEW-03-002; 28076-A-NEW-03-003; 28076-A-BLKA-03-000 Rev P1; 28076-A-BLKA-03-001; 28076-A-BLKA-03-002; 28076-A-BLKA-03-003; 28076-A-BLKA-03-004; 28076-A-BLKA-03-005; 28076-A-BLKB-03-000 Rev P1; 28076-A-BLKB-03-001; 28076-A-BLKB-03002; 28076-A-BLKB-03-003; 28076-A-BLKB-03-004; 28076-A-BLKB-03005; 28076-A-BLKC-03-000 P1; 28076-A-BLKC-03-001; 28076-A-BLKC-03002; 28076-A-BLKC-03-003; 28076-A-BLKC-03-004; 28076-A-BLKC-03005; 28076-A-BLKD-03-000 Rev P1; 28076-A-BLKD-03-001; 28076-A-BLKD-03-002; 28076-A-BLKD-03-003; 28076-A-BLKD-03-004; 28076-A-BLKD-03-005; 28076-A-BLKA-04-001; 28076-A-BLKD-04-001; 28076-A-04001; 28076-A-04-002; 28076-A-04-003; 28076-A-BLKA-05-001; 28076-A-BLKA-05-002; 28076-A-BLKA-05-003; 28076-A-BLKA-05-004; 28076-A-BLKA-05-005; 28076-A-BLKA-05-006; 28076-A-BLKB-05-001; 28076-A-BLKB-05-002; 28076-A-BLKB-05-003; 28076-A-BLKB-05-004; 28076-A-BLKC-05-001; 28076-A-BLKC-05-002; 28076-A-BLKC-05-003; 28076-A-BLKC-05-004; 28076-A-BLKD-05-001; 28076-A-BLKD-05-002; 28076-A-BLKD-05-003; 28076-A-BLKD-05-004; 28076-A-BLKD-05-005; 28076-A-BLKD-05-006; 28076-A-05-001; 28076-A-05-002; 28076-A-05-101 Rev P1.

## And Application Documents:

Environmental Statement Volumes 1 and 2 dated June 2014 including updates to Chapter 11 and an Archaeological Impact Assessment; Shadow Analysis; Service Vehicle Delivery Plan dated June 2014; Construction Logistics Plan dated June 2014; Residential Travel Plan Framework dated June 2014; Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment dated June 2014;
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Energy Strategy Report dated June 2014; Transport Assessment dated June 2014; Equality Impact Assessment dated June 2014; Environmental Statement (Non Technical Summary) dated June 2014; Design and Access Statement dated June 2014; Arboricultural Implications Report dated 2014. Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
5. The OUTLINE component of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Parameter Plans listed below, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
A-01-003 Rev P1; A-01-101 Rev P1; A-01-102 Rev P1; A-02-001 Rev P1; A-02-102 Rev P1.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning and to ensure the Devlopment keeps within the parameters assessed pusuant to the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Development.
6. The maximum number of dwellings to be developed on the application site (DETAILED AND OUTLINE components combined) shall not exceed 470. Reason: To ensure the Development is carried out in accordance with the plans and other submitted details and to ensure the Development keeps within the parameters assessed pursuant to the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Development.
7. The maximum number of car parking spaces within the DETAILED permission shall be 88 spaces.
Reason: To avoid obstruction of the surrounding streets and to safeguard public safety and the amenity of the surrounding area, in accordance with the NPPF, Local Plan Policy SP1 SP4 and SP7 and UDP Policies M10 and UD3.
8. Building, engineering or other operations such as demolition, works prepatory to or ancillary to the construction shall take place between the hours of 08:00am and 18:00pm Mondays to Fridays, and between the hours of 08:00am and 13:00pm Saturdays only, and no works shall be carried out at any times on Sundays or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjacent residnets and the area generally and to meet the requirements of London Plan Policy 7.6 and Saved UDP Policy UD3.
9. All homes within the Development shall be constructed to 'Lifetime Homes' standards, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where compliance cannot be met with regards specifically to units within the hereby approved converted buildings, details as to why and evidence that best endeavours have been undertaken to achieve 'Lifetime Homes' standards shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of the non-complying unit.
Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.8, Saved Policy HSG1 of the UDP.
10. No fewer than $10 \%$ of the total number of homes for each tenure within the Development (DETAILED and OUTLINE components) shall be constructed to be adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.
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Reason: To ensure the provision of accessible housing in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.8, Saved Policy HSG1 of the UDP.
11. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town \& Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no:
A) roof extensions;
B) rear extensions;
C) side extensions;
D) front extensions; shall be carried out to any dwellinghouse hereby approved within both the DETAILED and OUTLINE component of the permission without the grant of planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to prevent overdevelopment of the site by controlling proposed extensions and alterations consistent with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
12. Prior to the installation, details of any gas boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water should be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority. The boilers to be provided for space heating and domestic hot water shall have dry NOx emissions not exceeding $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kWh}$ (0\%).
Reason: In the interest of energy efficiency, carbon reduction and sustainabiltiy, and as required by London Plan Policy 7.14
13. The exisiting wall located on the western boundary of the site, nearest those residential properties facing Warwick Gardens and adjoining their gardens, is to be retained and repaired where necessary.
Reason: To protect the amenities of those western neighbours adjoining the site and in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.6 and saved UPD Policy U3.
14. Any artificial lighting within the development shall be of a focused and of a directional nature to ensure that there is no light spill into the adjacent SINC and ecological corridor
Reason: Artificial light can harm the ecology of an area through disruption of the natural diurnal rhythms of wildlife.

## Pre-commencement conditions

15. No development (including demolition) shall take place until a Demolition Manangement Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This plan shall also incorporate, but not be limited to, a risk assessment detailing the management of demolition and construction dust in line with the London Code of Construction Practice.
Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to preserve the amenities of the area generally, in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.6, Local Plan Policies SP1 SP4 and SP7, and Saved UDP Policy UD3.
16. No demolition or development shall take place until:
a) The applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a Written Scheme of
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Investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority;
b) No demolition or development shall take place other than that in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part a);
c) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programmed set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under part a), and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of the results and archive deposition has been secured.
Reason: Heritage assets or archaeological interest survive on the site. The Local Planning Authority wishes to secure the provision of archaeological investigation followd by the subsequent recording of significant remains prior to development (including preservation of important remains), in accordance with recommendations given by the Borough and in the NPPF.
17. No demolition or development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of historic buildings recording and analysis, which considers building structure, architectural detail and archaeological evidence. This shall be undertaken in accordance with a written scheme of investigation submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: Heritage assets or archaeological interest survive on the site. The Local Planning Authority wishes to secure the provision of archaeological investigation followd by the subsequent recording of significant remains prior to development (including preservation of important remains), in accordance with recommendations given by the Borough and in the NPPF.
18. No development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (incorporating a Site Waste Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to preserve the amenities of the area generally, in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.6, Local Plan Policies SP1 SP4 and SP7, and Saved UDP Policy UD3.
19. No development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) St Ann's Hospital, Haringey Ref: 25232/009 by Peter Brett, has been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage strategy shall include a restriction in run-off and surface water storage on site as outlined in the FRA and should evidence how the development will achieve green-field run-off rates. The scheme for each phase shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and improve habitat and amenity, in accordance with London
20. No development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level) shall take place until such time as:
a) A desktop study has been carried out, details of which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected given those uses, and other relevant 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, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Only if the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm may the development commence, upon the receipt of written approval from 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 in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:

- a risk assessment to be undertaken;
- refinement of the Conceptual Model; and
- 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 Planning Authority.
b) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk or 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.
Reasons: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety in accordance with Policy 5.21 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.
21. No development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a design framework (the Framework) for the entire scheme is submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Framework shall be substantially in accordance with the details submitted within the design and access statement and approved parameter plans.
Reason: To ensure satisfactory design for the development in accordance with the principles and parameters established at the OUTLINE stage.
22. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no above ground development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously
agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place within the DETAILED permission, as depicted in red on approved plan A-00-002 Rev 1, 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.
23. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no above ground development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) 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.
24. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no above ground development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until full details of both hard and 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. These details shall include (but not limited to: proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; use of permeable and semi-permeable paving to the car parking area hereby approved; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.
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; implementation programme]. The soft landscaping scheme shall include detailed drawings of:
a. those existing trees to be retained.
b. those existing trees to be removed.
c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.
Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season prior to the occupation of each. Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter.
Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Local Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
25. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no above ground development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place within the DETAILED permission, as depicted in red on approved plan A-00-002 Rev 1, until details of pedestrian access points from St Ann's Road and rear parking areas to Blocks A, B, and C have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, but not limited to, how these areas have incorporated secure by design principles to ensure the areas are secure, adequately landscaped and have appropriate surveillance. The details approved shall then be implemented and retained in perpetuity.
Reason: To ensure parking areas and pedestrian access to the site is safe and secure in accordance with the NPPF, London Plan Policies 7.1, 7.3, 7.4 and saved UDP Policy UD3
26. No impact piling within each phase shall take place on site until a piling method statement (detailing depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such poling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage and water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling within each phase must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.
Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility and water infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.
27. No development within each phase shall take place (including demolition) until a drainage strategy detailing any of and/or off site drainage works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be accepted into the public system until the
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drainage works referred to in the strategy for each phase have been completed.
Reason: The development may lead to sewage flooding; to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development; and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community.
28. No development shall take place within each phase (including demolition) until an impact study of the existing water supply infrastructure has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Thames Water. The study should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point. Should additional capacity be required, the impact study should include ways in which this capacity will be accommodated. The development within each phase will then be implemented in accordance with the recommendations of this impact study and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the addition demand created by the development.
29. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place within each phase until details of the hereby approved substations located within the northern portion of the site (DETAILED component). Details shall include, but not limited to, noise output, design and appearance, materials, adjacent landscaping treatments. The development shall be implemented in accordance with these approved details and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residential neighbours and to ensure an acceptable design and appearance.
30. No development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a full, detailed assessment of all site emissions, including emissions from all energy sources, is submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The final design is to be Air Quality Neutral In line with the London Plan with respect to all emissions from the site. If the proposed development is not air quality neutral, a scheme of mitigation is to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development within each phase will then be implemented in accordance with these approved details and mitigation measures and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
Reason: To promote sustainable development and reduce emissions in accordance with London Plan 2011 Policy 7.14, as well as Policy SP4 of Haringey's Local Plan 2013
31. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, no demolition works should be undertaken to the front boundary wall unless a minimum of Level 2 recording of the wall along the northern boundary of the site as per English Heritage's guidance to 'Understanding Historic Buildings:

A guide to good recording practice' has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure accurate recording of the heritage asset.
32. No above ground development (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until detail, within the DETAILED permission, 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 143 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.
33. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority full details of a site wide ecology management strategy and associated pollution prevention strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works.
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development maximises the ecological potential of the site and prevents pollution of the environment prior to the commencement of development in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment and policies London Plan Policy 7.19 and Local Plan Policy SP13.
34. No development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until full detail of a scheme for external lighting for that part of the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such agreed scheme to be implemented and permanently retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development provides a safe and sound environment for the future occupiers and patrons in with the Environmental Impact Assessment and policies London Plan Policy 7.19 and Local Plan Policy SP13.
35. No development within each phase (save for demolition above ground level and those temporary and/or advanced infrastructure and enabling works previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall take place until a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved and maintained thereafter.
Reason: To protect/conserve/enhance the natural features and character of the area.

## Pre-Reserved Matters Conditions
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36. Prior to the submission of a Reserved Matters application for phase R2, as depicted in blue on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1, a comprehensive landscaping scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority depicting how the SINC to the south of the site will be improved. Details shall include, but not limited to, species, size, and type of replanting.
Reason: In the interests of improving the visual amenity and biodiversity in the area in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.19 and Local Plan Policy SP13.
37. Prior to the submission of Reserved Matters for each of the residential phases of the permission, Phases R1, R2, R3, and/or R4, as depicted in blue on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1, design codes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Each design code should respond to the Design Framework for the entire site to be approved pursuant to Condition 21 and will include:
a) A three dimensional masterplan of that phase and its adjoining phases that shows clearly the intended arrangment of spaces and buildings, including massing, orientation, distribution of uses, densities, building lines, and spaces;
b) The design principles for that phase including information on dwelling types, pallete of materials, parking, safety and security and information on the protection of resindetial ammenity including privacy and overlooking;
c) An assessment showing that each phase has had regard to the BRE "Site Layout Planning for Sunlight and Daylight: A Guide to Good Practice";
d) Evidence that Secure by Design principles have been implemented in the design and layout.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority is satisfied with the details of the proposed development and that the proposed development will be seen as an enhancement to the St Ann's Conservation Area and surrounding townscape, in accordance with Chapter 12 of the NPPF and to SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology', saved UDP Policies UD3 and CSV5, London Plan Policy 7.8 and Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12.
38. Prior to the submission of any Reserved Matters application, details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority on the approved energy centre. These details shall include, but not limited to, confirmation that there will be a single CHP to service both healthcare and residential buildings, how the energy centre will connect to both residential and healthcare components on site, noise output, design and appearance, siting and location. The energy centre shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
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.
39. Prior to the submission of Reserved Matters applications for each phase, details shall be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority
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in writing, that both domestic and non-domestic buildings within the Development are designed to reduce potential overheating and reliance on air conditioning systems and demonstrate general accordance with the cooling heirarchy as outline in London Plan Policy 5.9 and that all domestic dwellings are designed without the need for active cooling. The development shall be implemented in accordance with these details and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
Reasons: To ensure that the development achieves a high level of sustainability in accordance with Policies 5.1,5.2,5.3,5.15, and 5.9 of the London Plan and Policies SP0 and SP4 the Haringey Local Plan.
40. Prior to the submission of any Reserved Matters application, details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority evidencing that the applicant has corresponded with the network providers of the Upper Lea Valley district heating network to investigate whether a site heat network is proposed in the vicinity of the subject site and, should there be, commitment to connecting to such a network should be explored under best endeavours. Reasons: To ensure that the development achieves a high level of sustainability in accordance with Policies 5.1,5.2,5.3,5.15, and 5.9 of the London Plan and Policies SP0 and SP4 the Haringey Local Plan.
41. Details of arrangements for storage and collection of refuse, for the development hereby approved, including location, design, screening, operation and the provision of facilities for the storage of recyclable materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA as part of the relevant Reserved Matters approvals for each part of the Development and the development shall be carried out only in accordance with the details so approved and shall be retained thereafter.
Reason: To ensure good design, to safeguard the amenity of the area and ensure that the development is sustainable and has adequate facilities, in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment, in accordance with Chapter 12 of the NPPF and to SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology', saved UDP Policies UD3 and CSV5, London Plan Policy 7.8 and Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12.

## Pre-Occupation Conditions

42. The hereby approved retail (A1 Use Class) floorspace shall not be occupied until a final Certificate has been issued certifying that BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable building which replaces that scheme) rating Very Good has been achieved for the hereby approved retail floorspace,
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.
43. The dwellings hereby approved (both within the DETAILED and OUTLINE component) shall achieve a carbon reduction in CO2 emissions of at least $35 \%$ under Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 standard and meet at least Code for Sustainable homes Level 4. No dwelling within each phase shall be occupied until a final Code Certificate has been issued for it certifying that this reduction has been achieved.
Reasons: To ensure that the development achieves a high level of
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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.
44. The Development shall provide at least 890sqm of equipped play space. Details of which shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the occupation of any dwelling within Phase R4 as depicted in blue on approved plan A-00-003 Rev 1. The Development will be implemented in accordance with the details approved and retained in perpetuity thereafter.
Reason: In accordance with the Mayor's SPG 'Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation' and Local Plan Policy SP13.

## Phasing Conditions

45. Not more than 250 dwellings on site shall be occupied until the Mental Health Inpatient Building, that forms part of Phase H1, is commenced, and not more that 420 dwellings on site shall be occupied until the Mental Health Inpatient Building is occupied.
Reason: To ensure that the healthcare component of the Development is commenced in a timely fashion and prior to the completion of the residential component of the scheme.
46. Notwithstanding the information submitted with this application, prior to the submission of Reserved Matters for Phase R2, details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority for the south-western access point within the application boundary. The development will then be implemented in accordance with the approved details, prior to the commencement of phases R3 and R4, and retained in perpertuity thereafter. Reason: To ensure a safe, attractive and functional accessway to the development and to promote the use of sustainable forms of transport, in accordance with the NPPF, London Plan Policies 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, Local Plan Policy SP1 SP4 and SP7 and UDP Policy UD3.
47. Upon the submission of each Reserved Matters application for the residential component of the Development (phases R1, R2, R3, and R4), details shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, confirming the affordable housing provision within the phase submitted, details of the overall affordable housing provision approved at the date of the submission, and an indicative plan/details for future phases (if any) of affordable housing provision. These details will confirm how the overall site will provide no less than 14\% (by unit) affordable housing units. Reason: To ensure 14\% (by unit) affordable housing units are provided for on site.
48. 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

development.

## Informatives

INFORMATIVE: In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our development plan comprising the London Plan 2011, the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and the saved policies of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 along with relevant SPD/SPG documents, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably. In addition, where appropriate, further guidance was offered to the applicant during the consideration of the application.

INFORMATIVE : Community Infrastructure Levy. The applicant is advised that the proposed development will be liable for the Mayor of London and Haringey CIL. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayor's CIL charge will be $£ 327,110.00$ ( 9,198 sqm of residential floor space and 148 sqm of retail floor space floorspace $x £ 35.00$ ) and the Haringey CIL charge will be $£ 137,970$. 00 ( 9,198 sqm of residential floorspace $x £ 15.00$ ). 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.

INFORMATIVE: Details of Highway Agreement - Section 278. The applicant is advised that an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Acts 1980 is required.

INFORMATIVE: All works on or associated with the public highway be carried out by Council's Transportation Group at the full expense of the developer. Before the Council undertakes any works or incurs any financial liability the developer will be required to make a deposit equal to the full estimated cost of the works.

INFORMATIVE: Prior to commencing any work on the highway official notification under The New Roads \& Street Works Act shall be given to the Council. Notifications are to be sent to The Highways and Street Numbering (tel. 0208489 1000).

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. 02084895573 ) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that prior to demolition of existing buildings, an asbestos survey should be carried out to identigy the location and type of asbestos containing materials. Any asbestos containing materials must be removed and disposed of in accordance with the correct procefure prior to any demolition or construction works carried out.

INFORMATIVE: The development of this site is likely to damage heritage assets of achaeological and historical interest. The applicant should therefore submit detailed proposls in the form of an archeaological project design. The design should be in accordance with the appropriate English Heritage guidelines.

## Page 45

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 16 MARCH 2015

|  | INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer <br> Services on 08458502777 to discuss the details of the piling method statement <br> required by condition. <br> Please note that the conditions referred to in the minutes are those as originally <br> proposed in the officer's report to the Sub-Committee; any amended wording, <br> additional conditions, deletions or informatives agreed by the Sub-Committee and <br> recorded in the minuted resolution, will, in accordance with the Sub-Committee's <br> decision, be incorporated into the Planning Permission as subsequently issued. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PC06. | UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS <br> The Committee considered an update on major planning proposals in the pipeline. <br> Clarification was sought on whether a further application for the Spurs stadium <br> scheme covering the provision of additional seating would come before the <br> Committee. Officers advised that Spurs had not to date submitted an application. <br> RESOLVED <br> $\bullet \quad$ That the update be noted. |
| PC07. | APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS <br> The Committee considered an update report on applications determined under <br> delegated powers between 1 and 28 February 2015. |
| RESOLVED |  |
| $\bullet$ That the report be noted. |  |

COUNCILLOR AHMET
Chair
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## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 25 MARCH 2015

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

MINUTE
SUBJECT/DECISION
NO.

| PC09. | WEBCASTING <br> RESOLVED |
| :--- | :--- |
| - That the Chair's announcement regarding the filming of the meeting for live |  |
| or subsequent broadcast be noted. |  |$|$

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.
[Cllr Akwasi-Ayisi entered the room late during the officer introduction and as such was unable to participate in the determination of this item].

Clarification was sought on the resolution of the issue of the access of refuse vehicles to the site. Officers advised that completion of a safety audit would be secured under condition to provide additional assurances over safety in light that a slight overrun had been identified under initial assessment.

Confirmation was also provided that the approval of materials would be covered under condition.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3573 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. Those being:

- 100; 110; 111; 151; 152; 153; 155; 157; 158; 159; 200; 299; 300; 301.

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. The proposal will require alterations to the public footway in order to cater for the new access arrangements. Prior to construction works being carried out on-site the applicant shall issue a Memorandum of Understanding that would secure payment for the required measures.
Reason: To maintain highway safety conditions for vulnerable pedestrian groups at this location and to create a safe route into and out of the school.
5. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on White Hart Lane is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid school drop-off and collection times and the AM and PM peak periods.
Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation and highways network and in the interests of highway safety.
6. The applicant is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval 3 months prior to construction work commencing on site. The plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on White Hart Lane is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid school drop-off and collection times and the AM and PM peak periods.
Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation and highways network and in the interests of highway safety.

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
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|  | development in a positive and proactive manner. |
| :--- | :--- |
| PC11. | BELMONT PRIMARY SCHOOL, RUSPER ROAD, LONDON, N22 6RA <br> The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning <br> permission for the proposed single storey extension of infants and junior primary <br> school to provide new and improved facilities and refurbishment and renovation <br> works to existing school areas adjacent to the extension. The report set out <br> details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant <br> planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights <br> implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions. |
| The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the <br> report. |  |
| Clarification was sought on whether the new extension would allow for the <br> removal of the portable classroom sited in the playground. The applicant advised <br> that this was not within the scope of the current project and that the objective of <br> the new extension was to provide bespoke facilities for pupils with special <br> educational needs. <br> The Committee agreed to add a tree protection condition covering the existing |  |
| tree onsite to any approval granted. |  |
| The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the additional tree <br> protection condition and it was |  |

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2015/0347 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 following approved plans and specifications:
5444-1000 Rev C, 5444-1001 Rev B, 5444-1010 Rev B, 5444-1020 Rev B, 5444-1100 Rev C, 5444-1200 Rev C, 5444-1201 Rev C, 5444-1210 Rev C, 5444-1250 Rev C and 5444-1300 Rev C.
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
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|  | 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. <br> 4. Prior to commencement, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and implemented accordingly thereafter. The Plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on the High Road and Whitbread Close is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods. <br> Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the Transportation network. <br> 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. <br> INFORMATIVE 2: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:- <br> - 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday <br> - 8.00am-1.00pm Saturday <br> - and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays. |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC12. | HOLY TRINITY CHURCH OF ENGLAND PRIMARY SCHOOL SOMERSET ROAD N17 9EJ <br> This item was withdrawn from the agenda. |
| PC13. | ILSE AMLOT CENTRE FOR WOMEN \& CHILDREN SOMERFORD GROVE N17 OPT <br> The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to provide additional educational accommodation to increase provision for 2 year old children. 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. <br> The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. <br> Concerns were raised over the potential for rubbish to accumulate behind the section of boundary fencing abutting the perimeter of the extension. Officers advised that the removal of that section of fencing could be secured under condition. |
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Confirmation was provided that the finish of the extension would match in with the existing building.

It was agreed that clarification of the ownership of the land would be sent to Cllr Rice.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the additional condition covering the removal of the section of boundary fencing abutting the perimeter of the extension and it was

## RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2014/3478 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 following approved plans and specifications: 612444-02 Rev P2; 612444-03 Rev P3; 612444-04 Rev P2; 612444-06 Rev P2; 612444-LT-00-B-1001 Rev P1; 612444-LT-00-B-1002 Rev P1.
Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
3. The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing nursery building.
Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
4. 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 6 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.
5. Prior to commencement, a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local planning Authority and implemented accordingly thereafter. The Plans should provide details on how construction work would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on the High Road and Whitbread Close is minimised. It is also requested
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that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and coordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.
Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the Transportation network.

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: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
-8.00am-1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.


## PC14. MUSWELL HILL POLICE STATION 115 FORTIS GREEN N2 9HW

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the proposed conversion of former Police Station to 9 no. residential units. 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.

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. It was advised that the police station plot had been divided into two plots for sale and subsequently in separate ownership. The site would therefore be the subject of two separate planning applications, the current application constituting the first and covering development of the main police station building.

The attention of the Committee was drawn to a number of corrections to the report. Clarification was provided under paragraph 6.34 that the police station would have had a higher trip generation level than that projected under proposed residential use. An amendment was outlined to paragraph 6.37 in that 'the number of available spaces during the busiest period would reduce from 58 spaces to 4726 spaces when including the adjacent development site to the south'.

Officers outlined that the affordable housing contribution proposed was policy compliant and that the applicant had reaffirmed a commitment to proceeding with the contribution.

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

- The lack of on site parking constituted a primary concern, particularly as it was likely that the development would have higher than average car ownership levels. This would have a significant impact on on-street parking demand, exacerbating current issues with a lack of available spaces during peak daytime hours. It was also questioned why a contribution was being
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sought towards the feasibility of implementing a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in the area surrounding the site if on-street parking was not, as outlined, considered a problem.

- The affordable housing contribution proposed was thought to be derisory.

Cllr Berryman addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The scheme constituted the loss of another public building and would make no contribution to the local community.
- The affordable housing contribution and parking provision contained within the application were insufficient, particularly in light of the high existing demand for on-street parking in the area.

The applicant addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The proposed affordable housing contribution was policy compliant
- Extensive parking surveys had been undertaken for the scheme in accordance with industry standard methodology, focussed on provision within a 200 m radius of the site. These surveys had identified sufficient on street parking provision during peak times to accommodate demand, with 58 spaces minimum available in the area overnight. The projected net increase in vehicles from the scheme would be 7, taking into account the removal of a disabled parking bay. The police station had utilised on-street parking so would also have had an impact on demand in the area.

The Committee sought further clarification from the transport officer on his view of the application as set out within the report. It was explained that the transport statement provided by the applicant was robust but that the area suffered from high on-street parking pressure and the scheme would add to this pressure. Although evidence had been provided that spaces would be available during peak times, these would be distributed over a wide area, with those roads closest to the site suffering from severe pressure.

The Committee raised the following points in their discussion of the application:

- Clarification was sought on the potential mitigation implementing a CPZ in the area could have on parking demand. It was advised that it would help to a degree as the area suffered from displaced parking from a nearby CPZ but that higher demand in the area was for overnight parking which a CPZ would not cover. Implementation of a 24 hour CPZ was unlikely to be justifiable or supported during the required consultation process.
- In response to a question, it was advised that the second land parcel of the site covering the yard area was unconnected to the police station scheme but that refusal of the current application would render it unable to be converted to residential. Confirmation was provided that when the application for the second plot came forward, the cumulative impact on parking would be assessed as a material planning consideration.
- The potential of designating the scheme car free was queried. Officers advised that this was not feasible as the scheme did not meet the requirements in relation to the PTAL level or have a CPZ currently in place.
- Clarification was sought as to whether a precedent for on-street parking spaces had been established from the police station use. It was advised that it had not been possible to calculate the on-street parking demand from the police station as it was not operational at the time of survey. Hornsey Police Station had been used as a benchmark, which suggested
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|  | that demand was likely to balance out. <br> - Concerns were raised that the sale of the site into two plots might have been contrived to reduce the affordable housing contribution due. Officers advised that the original owner of the land was not one of the applicants and that the two new owners were separate legal entities. It was reiterated that the affordable housing contribution for the current application was policy compliant. <br> - Further assurances were sought on the officer recommendation to approve the application despite the reservations of the transport team regarding the impact of the scheme on parking pressures in the area. The Head of Development Management confirmed that consensus was always sought but that in this case, there was a difference in officer opinion regarding the definition of 'severe' impact under the NPPF. The planning service considered the 7 additional projected parking spaces associated with the scheme were acceptable in balance against the benefits of bringing the building back into use. <br> Cllr Bevan put forward a motion, seconded by Cllr Akwasi-Ayisi, to reject the application on the grounds that the scheme would generate street parking demand and that this would result in a significant adverse impact on existing on street car parking pressure which would impact on existing residents and potentially impact on highway safety at this location. At a vote, the motion was carried and it was <br> RESOLVED <br> - That planning application HGY/2014/1333 be refused on the grounds that the scheme would generate street parking demand and that this would result in a significant adverse impact on existing on street car parking pressure which would impact on existing residents and potentially impact on highway safety at this location. |
| :---: | :---: |
| PC15. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING 13 April. |

COUNCILLOR AHMET

Chair

Item No.

## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

| 1. APPLICATION DETAILS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference No: HGY/2015/0561 | Ward: Crouch End |
| Address: Site to rear of 38 The Broadway N8 9SU |  |
| Proposal: Construction of single storey temporary cafe / restaurant on a vacant site |  |
| accessed from The Broadway via Rose Place, formed from four recycled shipping |  |
| containers, including parking for two cars, bicycle storage and refuse and recycling storage |  |
| Applicant: Mr A Mehmet |  |
| Ownership: Council |  |
| Case Officer Contact: Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Site Visit Date: 10/03/2015 |  |
| Date received: 23/02/2015 |  |
| Drawing number of plans: 044.130, 044.131, 044.110D, 044.005A, 044.001D, 044.02. |  |
| 1.1 This application has been brought to committee because the Council is the |  |
| landowner and the level of local objection to the application and a ward Councillor call in. |  |
| 1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION |  |
| The application site abuts the town centre boundary and given its location and temporary |  |
| nature it is considered that is would not harm the town centre and could enhance the |  |
| vitality, viability in the short term and would not cause harm to the Setting of the Listed |  |
| Building or the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area. |  |
| It is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on neighbouring |  |
| amenity subject to a condition restricting the opening hours and providing a 1 year |  |
| temporary permission so that the impacts can be assessed before any further permission |  |
| is granted. The proposal would not have a significant impact on parking or highway safety. |  |
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## 2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives

Conditions

1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
2) In accordance with approved plans
3) Temporary permission for 1 year
4) Hours of opening
5) Waste storage
6) Parking

Informatives

1) Co-operation
2. Drainage
3) Fat trap
4) Hours of construction

In the event that member choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.
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### 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

### 3.1 Proposed development

3.1.1 This is an application for the construction of a single storey temporary cafe / restaurant on a vacant site accessed from The Broadway via Rose Place, formed from four recycled shipping containers, including parking for two cars, bicycle storage and refuse and recycling storage.

### 3.2 Site and Surroundings

3.2.1The application site is a vacant site set off the Broadway in Crouch End. It is accessed from Rose Place. The site lies within the Crouch End Conservation Area and is adjacent to Hornsey Town Hall a Grade II* Listed Building. The application site is adjacent to but falls outside the designated town centre.

### 3.4 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2010/0500 GTD 12-07-10 Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway London Refurbishment and conversion of the Town Hall Building comprising alterations, extension and change of use from B1 (Business) and Sui Generis to a mixed use scheme incorporating: D1 (Non-Residential Institutions), A3 \& A4 uses (Restaurants, Cafes and drinking establishment), D2 (Assembly and Leisure) and retaining existing B1 and Sui Generis (Theatre and performance venue) use. Alterations, extensions and change of use of Link Block and East Wing from B1 (office) to C3 dwellinghouses. Extension, alteration, refurbishment and change of use of the Broadway Annexe East Part from B1 office to A1 retail and B1 office (West part to be C3 residential). New residential development comprising 123 No. units in total ( $35 \times 1$ bed flats, $61 \times 2$ bed flats, $20 \times 3$ bed flats, $3 \times 4$ bed flats and $4 \times 4$ bed houses) and associated car parking at basement level, including residential accommodation in the existing Town hall (East Wing and Link Building), the Broadway Annexe (West Part) and Mews. Erection of sub-stations. Alterations and landscape improvements including to the Town Hall Square, and use of the square for both public events and markets / small festival uses.

HGY/2010/0501 GTD 12-07-10 Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway London Listed Building Consent for refurbishment and conversion of the Town hall Building comprising alterations, extension and change of use from B1 (Business) and Sui Generis to a mixed use scheme incorporating: D1 (Non-Residential Institutions), A3 \& A4 uses (Restaurants, Cafes and drinking establishment), D2 (Assembly and Leisure) and retaining existing B1 and Sui Generis (Theatre and performance venue) use. Alterations, extensions and change of use of Link Block and East Wing from B1 (office) to C3 dwellinghouses. Extension, alteration, refurbishment and change of use of the Broadway Annexe East Part from B1 office to A1 retail and B1 office (West part to be C3 residential). New residential development comprising 123 No. units in total ( $35 \times 1$ bed flats, $61 \times 2$ bed flats, $20 \times 3$ bed flats, $3 \times 4$ bed flats and $4 \times 4$ bed houses) and associated car parking at basement level, including residential accommodation in the existing Town hall (East Wing and Link Building), the Broadway Annexe (West Part) and Mews. Erection of sub-stations. Alterations and landscape improvements including to the Town Hall Square, and use of the square for both public events and markets / small festival uses.
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HGY/2010/0502 GTD 12-07-10 Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway London Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing buildings, including Courtyard infill building, Library garage, Mews studio, public WCs, and removal of prefabricated unit to rear of the Town Hall. Demolition of walls, fences and removal of trees

HGY/2013/0694 GTD 13-05-13 Mews Studio Hornsey Town Hall The Broadway Hornsey London In respect of planning permissions and consents ref: HGY/2010/0500, /0501 and /0502 for the refurbishment and conversion of the Town Hall Building, new residential development and associated car parking and landscaping, variation of conditions is sought to allow for the elements of the scheme not related to Hornsey Town Hall ("preparatory implementation works") to be implemented prior to the Town Hall development. Detailed variations as below: (A) Variation of conditions attached to HGY/2010/0500 is sought to allow for the elements of the scheme not related to Hornsey Town Hall to be implemented prior to the Town Hall development. Specifically, variation of conditions 3 (Materials Samples), 4 (Landscaping), 7 (Tree Works), 8 (Excavation), 12 (Construction Vehicles Management Plan), 13 (Demolition Management Plan), 17 (Lighting), 21 (Refuse Storage), 28 (Site Investigation), 30 (Archaeological Work), 31 (s106) and 34 (Daylight/Sunlight) and removal of condition 15 (Phasing)and its replacement with a s106 obligation, attached to planning permission ref: HGY/2010/0500 to allow for preparatory implementation works to be carried out. (B) Variation of conditions 2 (Contract for Works), 3 (Demolition Method), and 4 (Site Protection) attached to HGY/2010/0501 to allow for preparatory implementation works to be carried out, variation of condition 2 to allow demolition or partial demolition of the Town Hall to occur after contracts for Phase 1 refurbishments of the Hall have been secured, variation of conditions 3,5,6 and 7 to clarify building to demolished, variation of condition 4 to clarify which building the condition relates to, removal of condition 13a and its replacement with equivalent s106 obligation, attached to Listed Building Consent ref: HGY/2010/0501 and amendment of description of same Listed Building Consent to clarify that the "Mews" element is to be demolished.

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Hornsey CAAC
LBH EHS - Noise \& Pollution
LBH Cleansing - West
LBH Conservation Officer
LBH Building Control
LBH Transportation Group
LBH Food \& Hygiene
London Fire Brigade
Thames Water Utililties

The following responses were received :
Internal:
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1) 

Conservation
The 1 year temporary permission would ensure that the structures can be removed thus reinstating the setting of the listed buildings. It should be noted that this is not to be considered as a precedent for future development of this site. As a temporary installation for a limited period of time, the structure would be considered far less intrusive compared to a permanent structure that may cause significant harm to the listed buildings, therefore no objections.
2) Transportation

There are no highways and transportation objections to the development proposal.
3) Waste Management

No objections
4) Environmental Health Noise

Consider that there should be restrictions on the times that any external areas can be used to avoid late night disturbance of residents. Suggest that there should be no external use after 9 pm . Support the use of a continuous close boarded screen around the external seating area but recognise that there would need to be a degree of management of the area.

Provided the plant is correctly maintained it should not cause issues.
5) Environmental Health Food Safety Team

The siting of the extraction flue and provision of facilities is adequate.
External:
6) Thames Water

No objections subject to informatives

## 5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

### 5.1 The following were consulted:

53 letters were sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice was erected close to the site and an advert placed in the local press.
5.2The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 15
Objecting: 14
Supporting: 1
Others:
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5.3 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Overbearing and overshadowing
- Odour concerns
- Noise concerns
- Litter and refuse concerns
- Security concerns
- Highway safety
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Support for a new restaurant in the area
5.4 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:
- The elevation plans are incorrect and should show the containers as higher than the existing boundary wall (Officer Comment: The plans are considered to be accurate in this respect)
- The design statement refers to this as a community facility building which is disingenuous(Officer Comment: the proposal is not a community facility and has not been assessed as such)


## 6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
3. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the conservation area and the Listed Building
4. Parking and highway safety

### 6.2 Principle of the development

6.2.1 Local Plan Policy SP10 - Town Centres and Saved UDP Policies seek to protect and enhance the vitality and viability of the Borough's Town Centre's. The application site falls outside the designated town centre but abuts the town centre boundary. Given its location and temporary nature it is considered that is would not harm the town centre and could enhance the vitality and viability in the short term.
6.2.2 In relation to A3 uses Saved UDP Policy TCR5 states that "the Council when assessing proposals for restaurants, cafes, drinking establishments and hot food takeaway uses that fall within A3, A4 and A5 use classes will take into account the following:
a) the effectiveness of measures to mitigate litter, undue smell, odours and noise from the premises;
b) the hours of opening, operation and delivery; and
c) where appropriate the proportion of existing A3, A4 and A5 uses within the main town centres".
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6.2.3 In terms of the principle of the A3 use the proposal would not result in the change from an existing A1 use so would not result in harmful increase in the proportion of A3 uses within Crouch End Town Centre. Therefore the principle of the proposal is acceptable subject to adequate mitigation for noise and smells and opening hours.

### 6.3 Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.3.1 The London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6 Architecture states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, or sunlight, privacy overlooking, aspect and the avoidance of air, water, light and noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance.
6.3.2 Significant concerns have been raised in relation to the impact on neighbouring properties. With regard to overshadowing and an overbearing appearance, the site is surrounded by a 2 metre high boundary wall and the proposed containers would be 3 metres in height and some 2 metres from the rear boundary wall of the nearest neighbouring residential properties at the closest point. As shown on the applicant's site cross sections and their sunlight studies due to the height of the proposal and the distance from the boundary walls it would not have a significant impact on neighbouring daylight and sunlight or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring properties.
6.3.3 With regard to noise and disturbance the Council's Environmental Health Noise Team have been consulted and advised that the Noise Impact Assessment demonstrates that the plant would not cause noise issues for the neighbouring residents. There have been significant concerns raised by neighbours in relation to noise from the external seating area. It is acknowledged that it is difficult to assess the noise from external seating areas, however the proposal has been designed to minimise the impact as much as possible by orientating the structures so that the outdoor seating area is as far from the neighbouring boundaries as possible. This would mean that the noise from the outdoor seating area would be screened by the presence of the proposed containers. In response to concerns the applicant has now reduced this area to 12 covers and agreed to a condition that it shall not be used later than 7 pm . The Council's Environmental Health Officer advised that this area should be used no later than 9 pm so this is considered to ensure that there would no significant impact on neighbouring properties due to noise from customers using external seating. The opening hours of the restaurant will be no later than 10 pm weekdays and 11 pm on weekend nights. It is noted that there may be some noise from customers coming and going to the restaurant after the external seating area is closed however given the site's location close to a busy town centre area with several existing restaurant uses this is considered to be no more harmful than the current situation.
6.3.4 With regard to smells, the Council's Environmental Health Food Safety Team has been consulted and are satisfied with the extraction arrangements. This would also be controlled under Environmental Health legislation. With regard to
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litter the proposal would largely cater for onsite dining and does not propose takeaway so is not considered to generate significant concerns in relation to litter. Concerns have also been raised in relation to the lighting proposed, this has been shown in detail to be low level lighting largely close to ground level and screened by the proposed containers to ensure there would not be significant light spill to neighbouring properties.
6.3.5 Therefore it is considered that the number of external covers and restricted opening hours are sufficient to ensure that the proposal would not have any significant impact on neighbouring amenity. A condition will be imposed restricting the opening hours and providing a 1 year temporary permission so that the impacts can be assessed before any further permission is granted.

### 6.4 Impact on the Character and appearance of the conservation area and Listed Building

6.4.1 The application site is adjacent to Hornsey Town Hall a Grade II* Listed Building and falls within the Crouch End Conservation Area. There is a legal requirement for the protection of the Listed Building and Conservation Area and Historic Park. The Legal Position on the impact on these heritage assets is as follows, and Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 provide:
"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".
"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are "the planning Acts".
6.4.2 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise."
6.4.3 The Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council says that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or
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appearance of a conservation area or a Historic Park, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.
6.4.4 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
6.4.5 London Plan Policy 7.8 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets.
6.4.6 The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted and advised that given the temporary nature of the proposal it would not harm the setting of the listed building. The site is currently vacant and the proposal would introduce a contemporary building for a temporary period before the comprehensive development for the site and the Town Hall takes place. This is considered to enhance the character and appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area in the short term. The condition restricting the permission to a temporary consent will ensure that the proposed buildings are removed once the temporary period expires. Therefore overall officers consider that the proposal causes no harm to the Setting of the Listed Building or the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area.

### 6.5 Parking and highway safety

6.5.1 Local Plan (2013) Policy SP7 Transport states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport and adopting maximum car parking standards and car free housing wherever feasible.
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6.5.2 Concerns have been raised in relation to traffic generation and safety along Rose Place. The Council's Transportation Team have been consulted and advised that the application site has a medium Public Transport Accessibility Level of 4 and is served by the 41, 91, W3, W5 and W7 bus routes. These routes operate with a combined frequency of 131 buses per hour and provide frequent links to Turnpike Lane, Archway, Harringay and Harringay Green Lanes underground and rail stations. The site also falls within the Crouch End (A) controlled parking zone (CPZ), which operates Monday to Friday between 10:00 am - 12:00 noon and provides a degree of on-street parking control. It is therefore considered that the proposal is highly likely to attract individuals from the local area or those using sustainable modes of transport to travel to and from the site.
6.5.3 The Transportation Team note that the site takes its access from a privately controlled access road named Rose Place, which is lightly trafficked as it has the primary function of a service road. Rose place is restricted in width and has two segregated footways measuring just 0.6 m on northern side and approximately 1 m on the southern side. However the carriageway of Rose Place is surfaced in red brick weave at its entrance and this gives drivers the impression that they are entering into a different environment and is likely to lead to typically lower traffic speeds. This is further enhanced by the narrow carriageway width of typically 2.7 m which is further enhanced by the double yellow lines which run along both sides of the road. Although the narrowness of the segregated footway does not provide sufficient width to cater for wheelchair users and those using pushchairs, the nature of the access road makes it suitable for shared pedestrian/vehicular use in line with guidance set out within "Manual for Streets" (2007).
6.5.4 It has been noted that the refuse collection arrangements will feed into the existing setup and that servicing for the café/restaurant will take place outside the development's operational hours, which will avoid any increase in conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Although there is a requirement to secure the existing two on-site parking spaces under a private agreement, there will be no on-site parking for either staff or visitors. However, any patrons wishing to travel to the site using private vehicles will have the benefit of the "Crouch End Stop \& Shop" on-street parking facility available Monday to Saturday 8:00am 6:30pm.
6.5.5 The Council's Transportation Team conclude that the proposed development is unlikely to result in any increase in parking pressure within the vicinity of the site or result in any significant adverse impact upon the surrounding highway network. The proposal is therefore considered to acceptable in this respect.

### 6.6 Waste and Recycling

6.6.1 London Plan Policy 5.17 'Waste Capacity', Local Plan Policy SP6 'Waste and Recycling' and Saved UDP Policy UD7 'Waste Storage', require development proposals make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection. The Council's waste management team raise no objections and
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waste storage has been shown to the north of the site. Concerns have been raised in relation to servicing the bins on the site, although refuse vehicles would have to reverse to the site, this is the existing arrangement so there would be not significant harm to highway safety as a result of the proposal.

### 6.7 Conclusion

6.7.1 The application site falls outside the designated town centre but abuts the town centre boundary. Given its location and temporary nature it is considered that it would not harm the town centre and could enhance the vitality and viability in the short term and would not cause harm to the Setting of the Listed Building or the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area.
6.7.2 It is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on neighbouring amenity subject to a condition restricting the opening hours and providing a 1 year temporary permission so that the impacts can be assessed before any further permission is granted. The proposal would not have a significant impact on parking or highway safety.
6.7.3 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

### 6.8 CIL

The internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Major or Haringey's CIL charge.

### 8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions
Applicant's drawing No.(s) 044.130, 044.131, 044.110D, 044.005A, 044.001D, 044.02.
Subject to the following condition(s)
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 following approved plans and specifications:
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044.130, 044.131, 044.110D, 044.005A, 044.001D, 044.02.

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
3. This permission shall be for a limited period expiring on 01/06/2016 when the building hereby approved shall be removed and the land reinstated.

Reason: The building, because of its design, size, materials and or siting, is not considered suitable for permanent retention.
4. The use hereby permitted shall not be operated before 12:00 hours or after 22:00 hours Monday to Thursday, before 10:00 hours or after 23:00 hours Saturdays and before 10:00 hours or after 18:00 hours Sundays and Bank Holidays the external seating area shall not be used after 19:00 at any time.

Reason: This permission is given to facilitate the beneficial use of the premises whilst ensuring that the amenities of adjacent residential properties are not diminished consistent with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.
5. The proposal shall not operate until the provision of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities shown on plan 044.001 C have been 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.
6. The development shall not be occupied until the car parking and cycle storage shown on plan 044.001 C have implemented and thereafter retained. The car parking and/ or loading and unloading facilities shall not be used for any other purpose.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of vehicular and pedestrian traffic or the conditions of general safety of the highway consistent with Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2011 and Saved Policies UD3 and M10 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

## Informatives:

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
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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 8502777.

INFORMATIVE 4: Thames Water recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat trap on all catering establishments. We further recommend, in line with best practice for the disposal of Fats, Oils and Grease, the collection of waste oil by a contractor, particularly to recycle for the production of bio diesel. Failure to implement these recommendations may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and pollution to local watercourses.

INFORMATIVE 5: Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am-6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am-1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | INTERNAL | The site forms the rear of Nos 38b and 38c within the <br> Crouch End Conservation Area. The site also forms part <br> of the setting of the Grade II* listed Hornsey Town Hall <br> and the associated Annexe buildings, listed at Grade II. <br> The site is currently vacant and does not contribute to <br> the conservation area or the setting of the listed <br> buildings. | Noted,a temporary permission is <br> recommended in accordance with these <br> comments. <br> Conservation <br> The Town Hall itself is being considered for a <br> regeneration project to ensure sustainable future use of <br> the site. The use of the building would be more akin to <br> arts related such activities. <br> The applicant, in support of the application, has <br> submitted a Design Statement. I have reviewed these <br> documents from a conservation point of view along with <br> other planning documents and have considered the <br> impact of the development in accordance with the <br> Council's statutory duty as per Planning (Listed Buildings <br> and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990. I have not been <br> involved in the pre-application discussions. <br> commenTS: |



| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | number of containers to thee may reduce the overall scale of the proposal and address the concerns raised above. <br> CONCLUSION: <br> From a conservation point of view, in context of the recent case on Barnwell Manor, the discharge of duty to ensure that development should preserve or enhance the character of heritage assets has been considered. The proposed scheme, by virtue of its overall size and nature would neither preserve nor enhance the setting of the listed buildings or the character and appearance of the conservation area and would cause substantial harm to them. Whilst the use of the empty site and the activities generated would complement the uses in the Town Hall and enhance the conservation area, this would not outweigh the substantial harm caused by the proposal, as per the NPPF. As such, the scheme is unacceptable under current legislation and policies. <br> 10/05/2015 <br> Following my previous comments, the applicant now wishes to reduce the time limit of the structure to 1 year. Whilst my previous concerns still stand, the reduced time limit would ensure that the structures can be removed |  |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | sooner, thus reinstating the setting of the listed buildings. <br> I, therefore, do not any have further objections to it. <br> However, it should be noted that this is not to be <br> considered as a precedent for future development of this <br> site. As a temporary installation for a limited period of <br> time, the structure would be considered far less intrusive <br> compared to a permanent structure that may cause <br> significant harm to the listed buildings. |  |  |
| Transportation | The application site has a medium Public Transport <br> Accessibility Level of 4 and is served by the 41, 91, W3, <br> W5 and W7 bus routes. These routes operate with a <br> combined frequency of 131 buses per hour and provide <br> frequent links to Turnpike Lane, Archway, Harringay and <br> Harringay Green Lanes underground and rail stations. <br> The site also falls within the Crouch End (A) controlled <br> parking zone (CPZ), which operates Monday to Friday <br> between 10:00am - 12:00noon and provides a degree of <br> on-street parking control. It is considered that the <br> proposal is highly likely to attract individuals from the <br> local area or those using sustainable modes of transport <br> to travel to and from the site. | Comments noted. |  |
| The site takes its access from a privately controlled |  |  |  |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | they are entering into a different environment and is likely to lead to typically lower traffic speeds. This is further enhanced by the narrow carriageway width of typically 2.7 m which is further enhanced by the double yellow lines which run along both sides of the road. Although the narrowness of the segregated footway does not provide sufficient width to cater for wheelchair users and those using pushchairs, the nature of the access road makes it suitable for shared pedestrian/vehicular use in line with guidance set out within "Manual for Streets" (2007). <br> It has been noted that the refuse collection arrangements will feed into the existing and that servicing for the café/restaurant will take place outside the developments operational hours, which will avoid any increase in conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. Although there is a requirement to secure the existing two on-site parking spaces secured under a private agreement, there will be no on-site parking for either staff or visitors. However, any patrons wishing to travel to the site using private vehicles will have the benefit of the "Crouch End Stop \& Shop" on-street parking facility available Monday to Saturday 8:00am -6:30pm. <br> The proposed development is unlikely to result in any increase in parking pressure within the vicinity of the site or result in any significant adverse impact upon the surrounding highway network. Therefore, there are no highways and transportation objections to the above development proposal |  |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Waste Management | Commercial Business must ensure all waste produced <br> on site are disposed of responsibly under their duty of <br> care within Environmental Protection Act 1990. It is for <br> the business to arrange a properly documented process <br> for waste collection from a licensed contractor of their <br> choice. Documentation must be kept by the business <br> and be produced on request of an authorised Council <br> Official under section 34 of the Act. Failure to do so may <br> result in a fixed penalty fine or prosecution through the <br> criminal Court system. <br> Waste must be properly contained to avoid spillage, side <br> waste and wind blown litter. Waste collection <br> arrangements must be frequent enough to avoid spillage <br> and waste accumulations around the bin area and <br> surrounding land both private and public. <br> Access for waste collection vehicle must be unhindered <br> and vehicle should be able to access the collection point <br> in forward gear, collect waste and then leave still in <br> forward gear. | Noted |  |
| EH Noise | If approval were to be granted I consider that there <br> should be restrictions on the times that any external <br> areas can be used to avoid late night disturbance of <br> residents by "people noise". I would suggest that there <br> should be no external use after 9pm. You may take the <br> view that an earlier time is appropriate. <br> I would support the use of a continuous close boarded <br> screen around the external seating area but recognise <br> that this alone would not mask the noise of a boisterous | Noted. A condition has been imposed <br> limiting the operating hours and the outdoor <br> seating are to no later than $7 p m$. |  |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | group of diners and there would need to be a degree of management of the area. <br> With regard to plant noise I don't anticipate that will be an issue provided it is correctly maintained. |  |
|  | EH Food Safety | Satisfied that the provision of facilities have been met for kitchen layout and hand washing facilities and siting of extraction flue outlet in relation to neighbouring properties | Noted. |
|  | EXTERNAL |  |  |
|  | Thames Water | No objections | Informatives attached as recommended |
|  | Neighbouring Properties: | Concern with the principle <br> - The principle of the use is not acceptable <br> - The proposal is excessive and gives the impression that a full A3 licence will be applied for <br> - The site falls outside the designated town centre and is therefore an entirely inappropriate use for the site <br> Impact on neighbouring properties <br> - Concern for security at neighbouring premises <br> - The proposal block light to 5, 7 and 9 Weston Park <br> - The lighting proposed will create additional light pollution to neighbouring properties <br> - The proposal would be 3 metres high and | The principle of the use in considered under heading 6.2 and considered to be acceptable in this instance. Licensing is covered by separate legislation. <br> The proposal is not considered to impact on security of neighbouring properties. The site would be remain locked whilst not in use which would change the current situation Addressed in para 6.3.2 <br> Addressed in para 6.3.4 <br> Addressed in para 6.3.2 |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | will be overbearing and oppressive to the neighbouring properties <br> - The proposed extraction chimney will create odour pollution <br> - Storing food waste will create additional smells <br> - Impact on neighbouring properties through noise and disturbance <br> - Noise from extraction equipment will impact on neighbouring properties <br> - Air heating cooling and condition equipment are likely to generate substantial noise disturbance to neighbouring properties <br> - There is no provision for sound deadening on surfaces <br> - No information is provided on how human noise will be managed <br> - Loss of the enjoyment of neighbouring properties <br> - The proposal is intended to be open until 11 pm at night which will cause noise disturbance from customer noise <br> - Previous uses of the Town Hall have resulted in noise problems to neighbouring properties <br> - The NIA uses noise criteria based upon industrial uses and the proposed use is not an industrial use <br> - The noise assessment refers to outside seating but does not show these on the | Addressed in para 6.3.4 <br> The storage of food waste will be controlled under Environmental Health legislation Addressed in para 6.3.3 <br> Addressed in para 6.3.3 <br> Addressed in para 6.3.3 <br> The proposed containers are considered sufficient to screen internal noise from neighbouring properties <br> Addressed in para 6.3.3 <br> Addressed under heading 6.3 <br> Addressed in para 6.3.3 <br> The site is located close to a busy commercial area where some noise has to be expected from neighbouring commercial uses <br> The NIA has been assessed by the Council's Noise Officer who considers in adequate for assessing the plant noise |
|  |  |  | OFFREPC Officers Report |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | plans <br> - The NIA has not considered noise break out <br> - The NIA suggests a close boarded wooden fence which would not ameliorate any noise impact and is not shown on the plans <br> - A condition is not suitable for controlling noise generated by customers <br> - Early morning deliveries will result in noise to disturbance to neighbouring properties <br> - The extraction equipment would terminate at the height of the boundary wall but should terminate 1 m above the eaves of a property <br> - The temporary permission could be extended beyond 2 years <br> Waste and litter <br> - The proposal will create more waste which will exacerbate problems in Rose Place <br> - There is a strong likelihood of additional litter <br> Impact on the conservation area <br> - The proposal is not sympathetic to the Crouch End Conservation Area <br> - The scale of the proposal is out of character with the Conservation Area <br> Parking and highways concerns | It is accepted in para 6.3.3 that noise from outside seating is difficult to assess revised plans have been received showing 12 external covers <br> The Council's EH Noise officer accepts that the wooden fence would provide some mitigation and is shown on the plans The noise has been controlled by limiting opening hours Deliveries to the site are not considered to result in a material loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties in comparison to existing commercial operations in the area The Council's EH Team as satisfied with the extraction equipment <br> A temporary 1 year consent is recommended to assess the impact on neighbouring properties rather than the 2 year permission requested <br> Addressed in para 6.3.4 <br> This is addressed under heading 6.4 <br> The scale of the proposal is relatively low key in comparison to the approved scheme |
|  |  |  | OFFREPC Officers Report |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | - The proposal will cause traffic issues on <br> the Broadway and Rose Place | for the site and is considered acceptable <br> Rose Place has no street lighting and <br> would be dangerous at night <br> Concerns with increased pedestrians on <br> Rose Place and safe pedestrian access | This is addressed under heading 6.5 <br> This is addressed under para 6.5.3, the <br> traffic speeds are not considered to result in <br> a risk of accidents <br> This is addressed under para 6.5.3 |
|  |  | Support | A new burger place will be very good for <br> Crouch End | Noted |
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## Appendix 3 Plans and images

Site Location Plan


Existing site (looking north)
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## Existing site (looking south)



Existing site (looking east)
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Proposed site layout


Proposed south elevation


## Proposed north elevation
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3D Perspective


Item No.

## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

| 1. APPLICATION DETAILS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference No: HGY/2015/0507 | Ward: Fortis Green |
| Address: Thames Water Land off Woodside Avenue N10 3JA |  |
| Proposal: Change of use of land to horticultural use related to an existing educational |  |
| establishment. Construction of 12 planting beds, 1 shed and two polytunnels which will be |  |
| capable of being moved around the site. Erection of a 1.8m fence with access from the |  |
| existing footpath and management of trees located on the site including those subject to |  |
| Tree Preservation Orders. (AMENDED PLANS ) |  |
| Applicant: Mr Paul Terry Ambitious About Autism |  |
| Ownership: Private |  |
| Case Officer Contact: Gareth Prosser |  |
| Site Visit Date: 23.04.15 |  |
| Date received: 18/02/2015 |  |
| Drawing number of plans: 001, 002, 003, 201B \& 202C |  |
| SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION |  |
| - The siting, scale and appearance of the proposed structures would be very small in |  |
| nature and ancillary to the land designation as significant local open land (SLOL) |  |
| with no effect on its openness and adjoining sites. |  |
| - Appropriate management practices are outlined in the application submitted in |  |
| terms of impact on ecology and trees with any such minimal impacts outweighed by |  |
| the educational/ community value derived from the use of the land for horticultural |  |
| activities. A further management plan and commitments are conditioned. |  |
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## RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives and/or subject to sec. 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision;
2) In accordance with approved plans and reports submitted;
3) New fencing to be in a dark green colour;
4) Replacement trees to be planted;
5) Provision of updated Ecological Management Plan.

Informatives:
Requirement to comply with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
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4.0 CONSULATION RESPONSE
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### 3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

## Proposed development

3.1 The application has been submitted by Treehouse School, a purpose built school and centre for autism education, located immediately to the east of the application site. The application which has been amended slightly from that initially submitted is for the:

- Change of use of land to horticultural use related to an existing educational establishment;
- Construction of 12 planting beds, 1 shed and 2 polytunnels;
- Erection of a 1.8 m fence (with access from the existing footpath) on the eastern boundary and a 1.2 m high fence on the northern boundary;
- Management of trees located on the site including those subject to a Tree Preservation Order.
3.2 The proposal facility would also be used by the nearby Tetherdown School.


## Site and Surroundings

3.3 The site is a small area of land (less than 1ha) located on Thames Water Land to the north of Woodside Avenue. The site is bounded by an access road/ pedestrian route to the east, to the north by Fortis Green Allotment with the covered Thames Water reservoir to the west of the site.
3.4 The site consists of a small semi mature deciduous woodland and an area of grassland with scrub encroachment and some semi-mature standing trees. The site is located outside the Fortis Green and Muswell Hill Conservation Areas. The land is designated as Significant Local Open Land (SLOL) and a Site of Nature Conservation (SINC) (Borough Grade II) within Haringey's Local Plan 2013. Records show that historically the site was used as a bowling green.

## Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.1 HGY/2014/0840 - Erection of shed and two moveable polytunnels for horticultural purposes in conjunction with Treehouse School - Withdrawn 26-06-14

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following statutory bodies, internal consultees and local groups were consulted on this application:

LBH Transportation
LBH Education
LBH Arboriculture
LBH Nature Conservation
Fortis Green Community Allotments Trust
Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association
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Muswell Hill CAAC
Tree Trust for Haringey
Thames Water
4.2 The following responses were received:

Internal:

1) LBH Education - No Objection
2) Nature Conservation Officer - Requires the following points to be conditioned:

- $\quad$ Revised management plan with map showing the location of key features/compartments including woodland exclusion zones, pond, grassland, etc.
- 6 bat boxes or more.
- Bat and bird boxes to be put up in advance of site use.
- Pond to be installed prior to site use.
- $\quad$ Adequate access for foxes and hedgehogs in fence lines.

External:

1) Fortis Green Allotment Trust - The Trust support Treehouse's horticultural activities but raise the following objections:

- Proposed fence with detract from sites open nature and character and not add to the sites biodiversity. A tunnel effect will be created and the view from allotments damaged.
- $\quad$ Shed, polytunnels and fence will not contribute to the biodiversity of the site and will be visually instructive in the landscape.
- Proposal will interfere with local wildlife and exclusion zones are not shown on plans.
- Proposal does not comply with all the criteria of local plan policy OS3.
(Images submitted by Fortis Green Allotments Trust are included in Appendix 3)

2) Muswell Hill CAAC - The appearance of the proposed chain link fencing would not preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation Area. (Officer comment: site is not located in a conservation are).
3) Cllr Newton - Proposed chain link fence is a concern both visually and for wildlife.

## 5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The residents of 81 properties were consulted on the application. The number of representations received from residents in response to notification and publicity on this application are as follows:
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Supporting: 22
Others: 5
5.2 The following issues were raised in representations and are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

1. Damage to a natural wildlife habitat/destruction of ecological corridor;
2. Proposed fencing is too high/out of character;
3. Proposal will undermine SOL designation;
4. Disturbance to wildlife/loss of biodiversity;
5. Treehouse has enough facilities/can accommodate on existing land;
6. Fencing a smaller site area would be more appropriate;
7. This facility for children suffering from severe autism will serve to develop skills and improve their quality of life;
8. Land is underutilised;
9. Scheme is sensitive to the local environment;
10. Low intensity/low impact use comparable to the neighbouring allotments.

## 6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and Appearance
2. Impact on Ecology/Significant Local Open Land (SLOL)
3. Impact on Trees

## Design and Appearance

6.2 London Plan Policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' require development proposals to be of the high design quality and have appropriate regard to local context. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP11 and Saved UDP Policy UD3 'General Principles' continue this approach.
6.3 The application proposes to install a 1.8 m high chain link fence inside the eastern boundary of the site set behind the existing Victorian fence, which will be retained and made good. A chain link fence is also proposed to be installed along the northern boundary of the site at a height of 1.2 m . This will also be set inside the existing fence which will be maintained. Notwithstanding the objections received, the construction of both fences falls under permitted development to a height of 2 m as stated in Class A of Part 2 (Minor Operations) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. However, in response to objections received, this aspect of the proposal has been amended from that initially submitted; changing it from 1.83 m to 1.2 m on the northern boundary. In addition to being set in from this boundary the new fence here will be flexible/ stepped in order to get around trees along this boundary.
6.4 The proposed 1.8 m high fence on the eastern boundary would be approximately 30 cm higher that the existing railings and is considered to have minimal impact on the character and appearance of the area including the
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neighbouring conservation areas, largely maintaining views to the site from the public footpath. Boundary fencing to this height is present in the immediate vicinity on the opposite side of the footpath (enclosing Treehouse School's primary site) and within the boundaries of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. Therefore, the additional fencing will not be alien to the existing situation and, on balance will not have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. Given the substantial distance between the proposal and the Fortis Green Conservation Area, there is no concern regarding an impact on this designation.
6.5 The concerns of residents/ amenity groups in respect of the boundary treatment/ height have been noted and as pointed out above some changes have been made. It is now considered that an appropriate balance has been struck between safety needs of the children who would use this space and aesthetic considerations.
6.6 The proposed timber shed would be 2.5 m in height (ridge height) and 1.9 m at eaves and would have a depth of 6 m . The two polytunnels would be approximately 2.4 m in height and 6.2 m in depth. The structures would be set back approximately 16 m from the pedestrian route. The low level planting beds would be set back approximately 7 m from this boundary.
6.6 The proposed timber shed would be 2.5 m in height (ridge height) and 1.9 m at eaves and would have a depth of 6 m . The two polytunnels would be approximately 2.4 m in height and 6.2 m in depth. The structures would be set back approximately 16 m from the pedestrian route. The low level planting beds would be set back approximately 7 m from this boundary.
6.7 The proposal is also for the removal of a section of fencing along the eastern boundary to allow an access gate, which is considered to be acceptable. The application is considered to be in accordance with the policies outlined above.

## Impact on Ecologyl Significant Local Open Land

6.8 Saved UDP policy OS3 sets out a range of criteria that should be met if SLOL land is to be developed.

The Council will not permit development on SLOL unless it meets all of the following criteria:
a) It is ancillary to the use of the open space;
b) It is small in scale;
c) It does not detract from the site's open nature and character
d) It is required to enhance activities associated with the particular open nature and character; and
e) It positively contributes to the setting and quality of the open space.
6.9 In addition Local Plan policy SP13: 'Open Space and Diversity' states that 'all development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation through its protection, enhancement and creation of Sites of Nature Conservation (SINCs) and Local Nature reserves (LNR)'.
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6.10 As outlined above the application comprises small scale development including planting beds, a shed, two polytunnels and changes to the boundary fencing. Such small scale structures are very common and compatible with the use and function of land for horticultural use and ancillary to the land's designation as SLOL. Officers would also point out that such structures here are removable if in the future the land ceases to be used for such a use.
6.11 Officers view that overall such small interventions will not adversely affect the openness of the site nor be harmful to the broader Thames Water Land's designation as SLOL in compliance with saved UDP policy OS3.
6.12 The applicant has submitted an Ecological Constraints report and a Tree Survey which provides a detailed understanding of the site and measures to be taken including the removal and replacement of dead and diseased trees in line with good arboricultural practice. A 5 year Ecological Management Plan for the site has also been provided outlining the specific treatment of each habitat feature of the site. As per Condition 5 below some additional detail is required in respect of the Ecological Management Plan before the development commences on site.
6.13 The footprint of the proposed structures cover a small section of the site, facing the existing public footpath, leaving much of the site largely undisturbed, except for the management procedures outlined in the ecological survey. The proposal is overall considered to have a minimal impact on woodland and given the educational value and site's management practices outlined, the application is considered acceptable and in accordance with Saved UDP policy OS3 and Local Plan policy SP13: 'Open Space and Diversity'.

## Impact on Trees

6.14 A tree survey has been submitted with the application identifying 11 different species on site. These have been divided into categories relating to their quality and the need for retention or removal.
6.15 The survey carried out by AECOM states that 'Category B' trees should be retained, which has been incorporated into the proposal. Also identified are 'Category U' poor quality trees' which are recommended for removal 'in the interests of sound arboricultural practice with the replacement with suitable replacement species.
6.16 Objections have been raised in relation to the clearance of trees and woodland. The tree survey states that the proposal will have 'minimum impact' on the woodland and recommends that a formal management plan be put in place. As set out in the submitted Ecological Management Plan the measures to be taken are acceptable to maintain and manage the trees of amenity value within this woodland area. Clearance here will be largely limited to low tying vegetation or the removal of dead or diseased trees in line with good arboricultural practice.
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6.17 Given the above, the proposal is considered to have minimal impact on the site with the removal only of 'poor quality' trees with minimum disturbance to the woodland. Given this minimal impact, the appropriate management practices and tree replacements the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

## Conclusion

6.18 In terms of siting, scale and appearance the proposed development is very small in nature and ancillary to the land designation as SLOL with no effect on its openness and on adjoining sites. Equally given the appropriate management practices outlined, in terms of impact on ecology and trees, the proposal will have minimal impact with any such impacts outweighed by the educational/ community value derived from the use of the land for horticultural activities. As such the proposal is considered to be acceptable in accordance with saved UDP policies UD3 and OS3 and Local Plan policy SP13.
6.19 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

### 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions
Applicant's drawing No.(s) 001, 002, 003, 201B \& 202C
Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning \& Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.
2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications: 001, 002, 003, 201B \& 202C with the expetion of the chain link fence along the eastern boundary which shall be set behind the existing trees immediately inside the current fence line.

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.
3. The chain link fences hereby approved shall be finished in a dark green colour and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the site and the character and appearance of the area.
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4. All tree works must be undertaken by qualified and experienced tree work contractors and be in accordance with BS 3998:2010 recommendations for tree work. Replacement trees of a minimum $12-14 \mathrm{~cm}$ girth must be planted within 12 months from the date of removal of the trees identified for removal as identified with the tree survey report.

Reason: Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.
5. No development shall take place until an updated Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in specific addressing and providing clarity on the points outlined below, with the measures thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved plan.

- A map showing the location of key features/compartments including woodland exclusion zones, pond, grassland, etc;
- Provision of 6 or more bat boxes on site;
- Bat and bird boxes to be put in place in advance of the use commending;.
- Pond to be installed prior to use commending;
- Adequate access for foxes and hedgehogs to be incorporated in the new northern fence line.

Reason: To protect the flora and fauna and ecological value of the site in accordance with saved policy OS3.

INFORMATIVE: Please note that any approval given by the Council does not give an exemption from the requirements to comply with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), or any other Acts offering protection to wildlife. Of particular note is the protection offered to bats, birds and their nests, whilst being built or in use. For further information contact Natural England on 02079325800.

Appendix 1: Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies

| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INTERNAL | Nature Conservation - any development should be subject the provision of the following: <br> Revised management plan with map showing the location of key features/compartments including woodland exclusion zones, pond, <br> grassland, etc. <br> 6 bat boxes or more. <br> Bat and bird boxes to be put up in advance of site use. <br> Pond to be installed prior to site use. <br> Adequate access for foxes and hedgehogs in fence lines | The following condition has been added: <br> No development shall take place until an updated Ecological Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in specific addressing and providing clarity on the points outlined below, with the measures thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved plan. <br> - Map showing the location of key features/compartments including woodland exclusion zones, pond, grassland, etc; <br> Provision of 6 or more bat boxes on site; <br> Bat and bird boxes to be put in place in advance of the use commending;. <br> Pond to be installed prior to use commending; <br> Adequate access for foxes and hedgehogs to be incorporated in the new northern fence line. |
| 1. | Muswell Hill CAAC | We would suggest that the Council should satisfy itself that the impact of the proposal on the open nature of the site is as minimal as possible, especially bearing in | The site is not located within the boundary of the Conservation Area. However, the character and appearance of the proposal |


| No. | Stakeholder |  | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | minds its SLOL status. <br> The objection is to the appearance of the proposed chain link fencing. This would certainly not preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the Conservation Area. Nor is it appropriate for this location <br> it would introduce a rather grim and forbidding inner city feel to this footpath. It is disappointing that the chain link fencing is the same as was proposed last year which was also the subject of much adverse comment. We understand that the applicant has undertaken to consider fresh proposals from local residents. We suggest therefore that there be a Condition requiring samples of the proposed new fencing to be submitted for approval, and stating that that the fencing as currently proposed is not acceptable. <br> This final point is rather beyond the remit of the CAAC, but the Council may also wish to impose a Condition requiring the provision of holes at the bottom of the fence to permit wildlife to pass on and off the site. | has been considered and the proposed fence to the northern boundary reduced in height. |
| 2. | Cllr Newton |  | 1. Proposed chain link fence is a concern both visually and for wildlife. | 1. The fence is with Permitted Develoopnment rights as stated in Class A of Part 2 (Minor Operations) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. The proposed fence to the northern boundary has been reduced. |
| 3. | Fortis Community | Green Allotment | 1. Proposed fence with detract from sites open nature and character and not add to the sites | 1. The proposed fence is only 30 cm taller on the eastern boundary and is |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trust | biodiversity. A tunnel effect will be created and the view from allotments damaged. <br> 2. Shed, polytunnels and fence will not contribute to the biodiversity of the site and will be visually instructive in the landscape. <br> 3. Proposal will interfere with local wildlife and exclusion zones are not shown on plans. <br> 4. Proposal does not comply with all the criteria of local plan policy OS3 | with Permitted Develoopnment rights as stated in Class A of Part 2 (Minor Operations) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. A reduction on the northern boundary has been incorporated into amended plans. <br> 2. The proposal is modest is size and scale. The submitted tree survey states that the proposal will have 'minimum impact' on the woodland and no healthy trees removed. <br> 3. Similarly to above, the modest size and intermittent use of the site is not seen as having a significant effect on local wildlife. The vast majority of the site remains untouched. <br> 4. This is discussed in the report above. |
| 4. | Local Residents | 11. Damage to a natural wildlife habitat/Destruction of Ecological Corridor <br> 12. Proposed fencing is to high/out of character <br> 13. Proposal undermined SOL designation <br> 14. Disturbance of wildlife/loss of biodiversity <br> 15. Reducing fencing to a smaller site is more appropriate | Addressed in report above. |


| No. | Stakeholder | Question/Comment | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 16. Proposal will not have a significant impact on local wildlife <br> 17.An additional facility for children suffering from severe autism to develop skills and quality of life <br> 18. Land is underutilised <br> 19. Scheme is sensitive to the local Environment |  |
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## Appendix: 2 Plans and Images



Site Location Plan


Aerial View of Site


Drawing 1: Site Plan


Drawing 2: Existing eastern boundary with associated changes and outline of structures behind
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Drawing 3: Northern and southern boundaries with associated changes and outline of structures behind
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Photo 1: Eastern boundary of site next to public footpath. New chain link fence set behind existing boundary fence


Photo 2: Southern boundary of site - Existing fence and dense hedge retained.
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Photo 3: Western boundary of site - Existing fence retained.


Photo 4: Indicative scale of structures

FORTIS GREEN COMMUNITY ALLOTMENTS TRUST

85 Fortis Green, East Finchley, London N2 9HU


Fortis Green Community Allotmerts Trust (a limited company) Company number 7022582 Registered in England and Wales Registered office 85 Fortis Green East Finchley London N2 9HU
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## FORTIS GREEN COMMUNITY ALLOTMENTS TRUST

85 Fortis Green, East Finchley, London N2 9HU
DRAWING 2


85 Fortis Green, East Finchley, London N2 9HU
DRAWING 3
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PROPOSED CHAIN LINK FENCE BEHIND RAILINGS ON ACCESS ROUTE FROM WOODSIDE AVENUE
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## REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

| 1. APPLICATION DETAILS |
| :--- | :--- |
|  <br> HGY/2015/0735 |
| Address: Stroud Green Primary School Woodstock Road N4 3EX Stroud Green <br> Proposal: Installation of gas fired condensing boilers complete with new stainless <br> steel flue and screening (Planning Application) <br> Listed Building consent for installation of gas fired condensing boilers complete with <br> new stainless steel flue and screening (Listed Building Application) |
| Applicant: Mr Steve Barns London Borough Of Haringey |
| Ownership: Council |
| Case Officer Contact: Malachy McGovern |
| Date received: 11/03/2015 <br> Drawing number of plans: 2001 and 2002 <br> 1. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION <br> - The siting of the flue and measures to minimise its appearance are considered <br> acceptable as such ensuring the proposal is sensitively considered in terms of <br> the appearance and setting of this Listed Building, preserving the character and <br> appearance of the conservation area and not causing harm. <br> - The Council is the applicant and as such these applications are being referred <br> to the Planning Sub-Committee. |
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## 2. RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and listed building consent and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives:

Planning Application
1 )Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
2) In accordance with approved plans

Listed Building Application
1 )Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
2) In accordance with approved plans

In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to Officers' recommendation Members will need to state their reasons.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4.0 CONSULATION RESPONSE
5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6.0 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- Appearance/ Impact on Listed Building
- Impact on Residential Amenity
7.0 RECOMMENDATION


## 3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

## Proposed development

3.1 The application seeks planning permission and listed building consent for the installation of a gas fired condensing boiler complete with new stainless steel flue and screening. The existing gas fired boilers are over 23 years old and unreliable with many parts difficult to source. The boilers will be housed in the same structure however the existing external flue arrangement needs to change as discharging the products of combustion close to ground floor windows and the school playground is no longer compatible with current Building Regulations.

## Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site comprises a large detached three storey building located on the western side of Woodstock Road, immediately south east of Perth Road. The property is a Grade II Listed Building and is located within Stroud Green Conservation Area.

## Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

## Planning History

HGY/1999/1047 GTD 28-09-99 - Erection of temporary 2 storey structure to provide new classroom and nursery.

HGY/1999/1171 GTD 28-09-99 - Demolition of existing classroom building.
HGY/2001/0623 GTD 12-06-01 Stroud Green Primary School Woodstock Road London Erection of a single storey shed for storage of outdoor play equipment for nursery reception classes.

HGY/2005/2305 GTD 07-02-06 - Removal of external dumb waiter and replacement with windows. Internal alterations to reception and activity rooms. Installation of platform lift and folding partitions, refurbishment of WCs (Listed Building Consent).

HGY/2005/2306 GTD 07-02-06 - Removal of dumb waiter and replacement with windows.

HGY/2006/2097 GTD 05-12-06 - Installation of bike shed and bike stand. Removal of gate and replacement with new.

HGY/2006/2468 GTD 06-02-07- Approval Of Details pursuant to Condition 3 (materials and plans) attached to Planning Permission reference HGY/2005/2305 (Removal of external dumb waiter and replacement with windows. Internal alterations to reception and activity rooms. Installation of platform lift and folding partitions, refurbishment of WCs (Listed Building Consent)).

HGY/2006/2469 GTD 06-02-07 - Listed Building Consent for installation of folding screen to first floor of annexe.

HGY/2011/0484 GTD 03-05-11- Erection of timber canopy in school playground
OLD/1975/1259 GTD 09-09-75 - Conversion of 2 classes as nursery classes \& construction of link, 2 stores \& 2 covered play area.

OLD/1975/1260 GTD 04-08-75 - Conversion of 2 classes as nursery classes \& construction of link, 2 stores \& 2 covered play area. (Listed Building Application).

OLD/1976/1276 GTD 17-11-76 Demolition of 19-25 (odd) and 28-32 (even) Ennis Road and the closure of the northern section of Ennis Road to form playground extension.

OLD/1978/1328 GTD 14-09-78 - Conversion of ground floor into nursery.
OLD/1979/1316 GTD 05-02-79 The conversion ground floor of existing infants classrooms for nursery use (Phase-II) Listed Building Consent.

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Building Control
- LBH Conservation
- LBH Education
- Stroud Green Residents Association
- Stroud Green CAAC
4.2 The following responses were received:


## LBH Conservation

This is a listed building (grade II) within the Stroud Green Conservation Area. It is a later 19th Century building with projecting gabled wings a slightly projecting five bay centrepiece under higher hipped roof crowned by cupola. There also smaller cupolas at either end. Overall, the building is three storeys high in stock brick with red brick window dressings and rusticated quoins. The roof is tiled with moulded brick modillion eaves cornice.

The applicant, in support of the application, has submitted a Design and Access Statement. I have reviewed these documents from a conservation point of view along with other planning documents and have considered the impact of the development in accordance with the Council's statutory duty as per Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990. I have also assessed this site independently including a site visit and have been involved during some pre-application discussions.
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The significance of the building relates to its aesthetic and architectural uality and the contribution it makes to the Stroud Green Conservation Area by virtue of its prominent street location. Its robust plan form and structure makes it a significant building within the area and contributes positively to it.

The scheme proposes to install gas fired condenser boilers along with a new stainless steel flue. The equipment has been located discretely and as would not be considered to cause harm to the listed building or the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is recommended however, that the steel flue is matt finished in a terracotta red colour so that it blends with the building's appearance. This should be conditioned "The stainless steel flue is finished in a matt finish and a 'terracotta red' colour".

## 5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application was publicised by way of 13 letters to neighbouring properties and a site notice and no representations were received.

## 6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- Impact on the appearance of the building/ listed building/ conservation area;
- Impact on amenity.


## Appearance and impact on Listed Building/ Conservation Area

6.2 As noted above the subject property is a Grade II listed building and as such there is a legal requirement for its protection. The Legal Position on the impact on these heritage assets is as follows, and Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 provide:
"In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses".
"In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are "the planning Acts".
6.3 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding
whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise."
6.4 The Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council says that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area or a Historic Park, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.
6.5 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.
6.6 London Plan Policy 7.8 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets.
6.7 The requirements of Local Plan policy SP12 'Conservation' and saved policy CSV4 'Alterations to Listed Buildings' apply in this case, as well as the guidance contained in SPG2. Policy CSV4 states that it is required that alterations and extensions to listed buildings to:

- be necessary and not detrimental to the architectural and historical integrity and detailing of a listed building's interior and exterior;
- relate sensitively to the original building; and
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- not adversely affect the setting of a listed building.
6.8 The proposed new boiler would be located within the existing store on the western (Perth Road) side of the school. The only visible element would be the new flue which would rise approximately 0.5 metres above the existing store and span 6 metres across to a side flank wall before rising approximately 12.5 metres up this flank wall, rising approximately 0.8 metres above the lower roof ridge.
6.9 The submitted drawings indicate that a softwood screen would be placed in front of the horizontal element of the flue with the vertical section of the flue finished in a matt earthen/ terracotta colour. Views of the flue from the building frontage would be shielded by its location behind a decorative quoin detail and from outside the site by the presence of trees inside the front boundary of the site.
6.10 In the context of the policy tests of CSV4 outlined above, the development here is considered necessary for the day to day functioning of this school. The siting of the flue and measures to minimise its appearance are considered acceptable as such ensuring the proposal is sensitively considered in terms of the appearance and setting of this Listed Building, preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area and not causing harm to the Conservation Area or the Listed Building. As such the proposal accords with London Plan polices 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan policy SP12 and saved policy CSV4.


## Impact on residential amenity

6.11 The London Plan 2011 policy 7.6 'Architecture' states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity.
6.12 The flue will have no impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties given the distances in question.

## Conclusion

6.13 The siting of the flue and measures to minimise its appearance are considered acceptable as such ensuring the proposal is sensitively considered in terms of the appearance and setting of this Listed Building, preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area and not causing harm to it or the Listed Building.
6.14 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission and listed building consent should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decisions are set out in the RECOMMENDATION below.

### 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS
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### 7.1 GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION (HGY/2015/0734) subject to conditions

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 2001 and 2002
Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning \& Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.
2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans (Drawing's 2001 \& 2002) as approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority with the colouration of the external flue to be in a terracotta colour coating to match the existing brickwork.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and to safeguard the architectural character and appearance of this Listed Building.

### 7.2 GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT (HGY/2015/0735) subject to conditions

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 2001 and 2002
Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans (Drawing's 2001 \& 2002) as approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority with the colouration of the external flue to be in a terracotta colour coating to match the existing brickwork.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and to safeguard the architectural character and appearance of this Listed Building.
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## APPENDIX 1

## Site Location Plan
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Photo 1


View from Perth Road
Location of flue set behind decorative quoin detail
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Drawing



Location of flue set behind decretive quoin detail
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## Drawing
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## Pre-application briefing to Committee

## 1. DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Ref: PRE/2015/0034
Site Address: 191-201 Archway Road, London N6 5BN
Ward: Highgate

Description: The proposal is for the retention and enhancement to the existing building facing Archway Road: Provision of 25 new residential dwellings; Provision of circa 372 sqm of A1 commercial floor space; and Provision of circa. 739 sqm of D1/D2 floor space

Applicant: Archway Apartments Ltd
Agent: Savills
Ownership: Private
Case Officer: Aaron Lau
2. BACKGROUND
2.1 The proposed development is being reported to Planning Sub Committee to enable members to view it at an early stage. Any comments made are of a provisional nature only and will not prejudice the final outcome of any planning application submitted for formal determination. It is anticipated that the proposal will be presented to the Planning Committee later in the year.
3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
3.1 The site, the subject of the pre-application is currently occupied by three storey terraced buildings consisting of an assortment of different units namely: a ground floor vacant furniture shop - 'Richardson of Highgate' (Use Class A1); a number of House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) units (Use Class C4); and B1a, B1c, D1 and D2 units located on the upper floors.
3.2 The site is located within Highgate Conservation Area The existing building is not statutorily or locally listed. Archway Road Local Shopping Centre is located on the eastern side of Archway Road (opposite the site). The area is characterised by a mix of uses and the building forms are generally consistent within the immediate locality.
4. PROPOSAL
4.1 The proposal is for the retention of and enhancement to the existing building facing Archway Road consisting of:
-Extensions at the rear of the building
-Provision of 25 new residential dwellings
-Provision of circa 372 sqm of A1 commercial floor space
-Provision of circa. 739 sqm of D1/D2 floor space
5. SITE HISTORY
5.1 None relevant

## 6. CONSULTATION

### 6.1 Internal/external consultation

6.2 This scheme is currently at pre-application stage and therefore no formal consultation has been undertaken. There has been no external consultation as yet as the planning application has not yet been submitted.
6.3 The applicant has been advised of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2011), which sets out the requirement of the developer engaging with and consulting the local community in planning and development issues. As outlined in the NPPF and the Council's SCl applicants of major schemes are advised to undertake early community involvement before submitting an application to the Council.
6.4 The applicant has undertaken its own public consultation exercise and has also approached and spoken to the amenity / interested groups within the community. Members will be able to obtain further information about the format and outcome of these discussions from the applicants on the evening of the planning subcommittee.

### 6.5 Development Management Forum

6.6 The proposal was presented at Development Management Forum on $18^{\text {th }}$ May 2015.
6.7 Residents raised the following main concerns:

- the loss of the existing studio workshop units;
- the impact of the new commercial unit on local businesses;
- servicing of the commercial unit;
- materiality of the proposed development;
- insufficient no. of parking spaces and impact on surrounding streets;


### 6.8 Quality Review Panel

6.9 The proposal was presented to a Quality Review Panel on 20 May 2015. The feedback will be tabled for Members on the evening of planning sub-committee on $1^{\text {st }}$ June 2015.

## 7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development - The principle of the proposal is considered acceptable. The residential units would contribute towards the identified need for housing within the Borough over the next 25 years. However, in respect of the 'lost' B1 floorspace, the applicant is required to submit robust evidence to justify the loss of employment generating floorspace on this site in particular the studio workshop uses, and also provide evidence to demonstrate that the enlarged class D1/D2 unit forming part of the development would meet local demand
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2. Design and appearance - The design of the extension and architectural detailing would need to be of an exceptional standard. The proposal would need to preserve and enhance, and not cause harm to, the conservation area and the visual amenity of the locality generally.
3. Affordable housing - The scheme would be required to provide $50 \%$ on-site affordable housing provision subject to viability, based on habitable rooms. It is anticipated that financial appraisal will be submitted with the formal submission of a planning application.
4. Housing mix - The proposed mix of units is considered acceptable. However, any scheme would need to provide full justification and reasoning of the mix of units proposed in order to determine the acceptability of the mix presented. The private and affordable units will need to be tenure blind.
5. Density - The proposed density should be guided by the London Plan "Sustainable residential quality density matrix".
6. Impact on residential amenity - A daylight/sunlight BRE report should be submitted to demonstrate the living conditions of the neighbouring properties along Archway Road and Causton Road would not be materially affected.
7. Quality of accommodation - The proposed units should adhere to the unit and individual space standards as laid out in the London Plan.
8. Parking and highway safety - The proposed development will need to provide minimum parking in line to London Plan parking requirements. Secure and covered cycling storage is required in accordance to the London Plan standards.
9. Accessibility - All units would be required to compliant to Lifetime Homes standards and $10 \%$ of the number of residential units should be wheelchair accessible. The commercial/communal aspects of the scheme should be Part M compliant.
10. Sustainability and Drainage - The London Plan requires all new homes to achieve a 35 per cent carbon reduction target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. This would be expected to be outlined in an Energy Strategy to be submitted with any application. Drainage should be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation.
11. Trees - The applicant would be required to provide details on how the neighbouring mature trees adjacent to the site and located in the front and rear gardens of the properties No. 203 Archway Road and No. 2 Causton Road will be protected during the construction phase of the development. A comprehensive soft and hard landscaping scheme would also be required as part of any submitted planning application.
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Proposed Site Plan
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## Pre-application briefing to Committee

## 1. DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Reference: PRE/2014/0152
Site Address: 255 Lordship Lane, N17
Ward: West Green

## Description of Development:

Demolition of existing buildings, construction of new access road, and construction of part 4 storey (plus basement) building comprising approximately 30 new residential flats and new commercial B1 floor space on the ground floor.

Applicant: Beckley Group Ltd
Agent: Oculus Architects
Case Officer: Malachy McGovern

## 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The proposed development is being reported to Planning Sub Committee to enable members to view it at an early stage. Any comments made are of a provisional nature only and will not prejudice the final outcome of any planning application submitted for formal determination.
3. SITE AND SURROUNDS
3.1 The site is located on the southern side of Lordship Lane (A109), just west of Lido Square and close to the junction with Awlfield Avenue. The site is rectangular in shape and measures approximately 33 metres wide by 63 metres deep ( 2079 sqm ) with a double access directly from Lordship Lane.
3.2 The site is currently in commercial use comprising low quality warehouse building, which is currently in use as a car wash and tyre repair shop with ancillary storage. Immediately west of the site is a vehicle MOT centre and small print shop adjacent to a terrace of inter-war period, two storey residential properties. Immediately east and south of the site are more modern residential developments and to the south west is a B8 distribution warehouse and depot operated by Haringey Council / Homes for Haringey.
3.3 To the north of the site on the opposite side of Lordship Lane is Tower Gardens Conservation Area comprising of a mixture of Victorian era and modern residential developments. The immediate area is therefore characterised by a mixture of commercial uses surrounded by modern residential development.
3.4 The site does not comprise any statutory or locally Listed Buildings and is not located within a Conservation Area, but as stated above, does fringe Tower Garden Conservation Area.
4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
4.1 The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site to provide commercial units at the
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ground floor and approximately 25-30 residential dwellings consisting of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units.
4.2 The applicant has agreed and negotiated with the Council the principle of a land swap with Haringey Council, which is in advanced talks in order to reconfigure the site and provide a central access road aligned with Awlfield Road immediately north. This has greatly improved access to the site and also to an existing council depot that is located at the rear of the site. The land swap can be viewed on the site plan drawings attached at the end of the report.
5. PLANNING HISTORY
5.1 There is no recent planning history for the site relevant to this pre-application.
6. CONSULTATION
6.1 Internal/external consultation:
6.2 This scheme is currently at pre-application stage and therefore no formal consultation has been undertaken by the Council. There has been no external consultation as yet as the planning application has not yet been submitted.
6.3 The applicant has been advised that the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2011), which sets out the requirement of the developer engaging with and consulting the local community in planning and development issues. As outlined in the NPPF and the Council's SCI applicants of major schemes are advised to undertake early community involvement before submitting an application to the Council. Officers have been informed that a consultation exercise is currently underway and Members will have the opportunity to question the applicants about this exercise.
6.4 Development Management Forum
6.5 The proposal is to be presented to a Development Management Forum in the very near future.

### 6.6 Quality Review Panel

6.7 The proposal was presented to a Quality Review Panel on $20^{\text {th }}$ May 2015. The feedback will be tabled for Members on the evening of planning sub-committee on $1^{\text {st }}$ June 2015.
7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development - the provision of a mix use scheme consisting of commercial employment generating space and residential units on the site.
2. Principle of a 'land swap' - to provide a new access road adjacent to the proposed building and into an existing council depot at the rear of the site -
which seeks to improve legibility of the public realm.
3. Design and appearance - the design, height and massing of the building and associated landscaping on the visual amenity of the streetscape and the locality generally. The proposal should seek to safeguard and not cause harm to the setting of the adjacent conservation area.
4. Affordable housing - the scheme would require the provision of $50 \%$ affordable housing on site. Likely to be subject to a viability report.
5. Housing mix - the housing mix within the full planning application would be 1,2 and 3 bed units in the form of self contained flats.
6. Impact on residential amenity - BRE Sunlight and Daylight report will be submitted with a planning application which will also include details of shadowing. Requirement for noise assessments and sound insulation scheme to protect future residents from adverse impacts on amenity in relation to noise nuisance. Assessment on overlooking / loss of privacy and increased sense of enclosure.
7. Impact on the adjacent Tower Gardens Conservation Area - the site does not fall within but 'sits' on the boundary with the conservation area. The application would require a heritage appraisal to illustrate how the building does not harm the setting and appearance of the adjacent conservation area.
8. Quality of accommodation - all accommodation must accord with Haringey and London Plan standards.
9. Parking and highway safety - parking is proposed in the basement. Secure and covered cycling storage is required in line with the London Plan standards as well as parking, disabled parking, and electric parking points.
10. Accessibility - all units would need to comply with Lifetime Homes standards and $10 \%$ of the number of residential units would be wheelchair accessible.
11. Sustainability and Drainage - The London Plan requires all new homes to achieve a 35 per cent carbon reduction target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. This would be expected to be outlined in an Energy Strategy to be submitted with any application. Drainage should be designed and implemented in ways that deliver other policy objectives, including water use efficiency and quality, biodiversity, amenity and recreation.
7.2 These matters are to be assessed prior to the planning application being considered at a forthcoming planning sub-Committee.
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## Pre-application briefing to Committee

## 1. DETAILS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Ref: PRE/2015/0057
Site Address: Beacon Lodge, 35 Eastern Road, London N2
Ward: Fortis Green

## Description of Development:

Part demolition and part retention and extension of existing building and change of use from C2 to C3 to create 3 dwellings, together with the construction of 6 flats in a 3-storey (plus basement) building, and a detached dwelling to the rear (10 residential units total).

Applicant: SAS Investments
Agent: Savills
Ownership: Private
Case Officer: Adam Flynn

## 2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The proposed development is being reported to Planning Sub Committee to enable members to view it at an early stage. Any comments made are of a provisional nature only and will not prejudice the final outcome of any planning application submitted for formal determination. It is anticipated that the proposal will be presented to the Planning Committee later in the year.
3. SITE AND SURROUNDS
3.1 The property at 35 Eastern Road is located on the western side of Eastern Road and comprises a part three-storey and part two-storey residential building. The original building has been extended in the past, and was used as a care home. There is a single storey residential building to the rear of the site, adjoin a parking area in Western Road to the west The site sits within a residential area, and is surrounded by a mixture of residential property types.
3.2 The building falls within the Fortis Green Conservation Area, but it is not statutorily or locally listed.
3.3 The site comprises one building which is currently vacant but was previously in Class C2 use as a home for destitute mothers, and was run by the Beacon Lodge Charitable Trust. The Council funding for the charity was stopped and the charity wound up its services as a result.
3.4 The site was vacated due to being surplus to requirements and the applicant has agreed terms to buy the site from the previous owners. Since the charity vacated the building, the site has been occupied by live-in guardians solely to ensure the ongoing security of the site.
4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
4.1 The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site that would consist of 10 new residential units consisting of both flatted development and family houses see description of development above for full details.
5. PLANNING HISTORY
5.1 There is no recent planning history for the site relevant to this pre-application.
6. CONSULTATION
6.1 Internal/external consultation:
6.2 This scheme is currently at pre-application stage and therefore no formal consultation has been undertaken. There has been no external consultation as yet as the planning application has not yet been submitted.
6.3 The applicant has been advised that the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2011), which sets out the requirement of the developer engaging with and consulting the local community in planning and development issues. As outlined in the NPPF and the Council's SCI applicants of major schemes are advised to undertake early community involvement before submitting an application to the Council. The developers have undertaken initial consultation and discussions with the local community to obtain their views on this pre-application proposal, which the developer's state has been met with broad support. Members will have the opportunity to ask the developers further questions about the consultation exercise.
6.4 Development Management Forum
6.5 The proposal may be presented to a Development Management Forum in the very near future.

### 6.6 Quality Review Panel

6.7 The proposal was presented to a Quality Review Panel on 20 May 2015. The feedback will be tabled for Members on the evening of planning sub-committee on $1^{\text {st }}$ June 2015.
7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development - The principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes is considered to be broadly acceptable, subject to the suitable justification of the loss of any 'existing use' of the site.
2. Design and appearance - To preserve and enhance, and not cause harm to, the conservation area, the proposed development has to be an appropriately scaled building of high architectural quality. Officers consider that the concept and principle of the proposal is acceptable in this Conservation Area setting, and the
modern detailing proposed is welcomed. However, details of the proposed detailing and bricks would be required.
3. Impact on the conservation area - The site is located within the Fortis Green Conservation Area. Any development should be designed to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and not to cause harm.
4. Affordable housing - Local Plan Policy SP2 requires developments of more than 10 units to contribute to the Borough's target of $50 \%$ of affordable housing contributions to the Borough's affordable housing stock However, subject to viability any proposed scheme providing less than $50 \%$ affordable housing must submit a viability report for assessment.
5. Housing mix - The proposed mix of units is considered to be acceptable, with a good proportion of family-sized units.
6. Impact on residential amenity - Any design proposal should consider the impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties, particularly those on Eastern Road (including any impacts from car parking adjacent to number 27). Any further submission should include an annotated site plan showing the distance between the proposal and the garden areas and dwellings on the neighbouring sites.
7. Quality of accommodation - London Plan policy 3.5 and Local Plan policy SP2 require high quality development to meet the standards of the Mayor's Housing SPG. From the plans provided, it appears that the proposed units would be of a good size and layout, with good sized rooms and access to amenity space.
8. Parking and highway safety - The proposal consists of 10 residential units (3 family sized units, 6 duplex apartments and 1 detached family house). This site is located in an area that has a medium public transport accessibility level of 3 and is within reasonable walking distance East Finchley underground station. Whilst prospective residents are likely to use sustainable modes of transport for a number of their journeys to and from the site, the large family sized units are likely to have a need for the use of a private vehicle. It has been noted that the scheme includes one parking space for each of the units. Given that the surrounding area suffers from parking stress, it is considered that the relatively high parking ratio is justified in this case. The proposal includes secure cycle storage, which is welcome.
9. Accessibility - All units would comply with the relevant standards and $10 \%$ of the number of residential units would be wheelchair accessible.
10. Sustainability - The London Plan requires all new homes to achieve a 35 per cent carbon reduction target beyond Part L 2013 of the Building Regulations. This would be expected to be outlined in an Energy Strategy to be submitted with any application.
11. Trees - The site is covered by a number of TPOs, and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted, which justifies the removal of some of the trees on the site due to their poor quality. The applicant has stated that 4 trees are to be removed, but it is unclear which trees these are, and if they are justified in the tree report. Given the site's TPOs and location within a Conservation Area, sound justification for the removal of any trees would be required with any application.
7.2 These matters are to be assessed prior to the application being considered at Committee.
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Site Location Plan
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## Site Plan
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Proposed Ground Floor Plan
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## Existing Front Elevation



## Page 148

Proposed Front Elevation


| Report for: | Planning Sub Committee <br> 1.6 .15 | Item <br> Number: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Title: | Applications determined under delegated powers |
| :--- | :--- |


| Report <br> Authorised by: | Emma Williamson |
| :--- | :--- |

## Lead Officer: Ahmet Altinsoy

Ward(s) affected:
Report for Key/Non Key Decisions:
All

1. Describe the issue under consideration
1.1 To advise the Planning Sub Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period from 1 March - 30 April 2015.
2. Recommendations
2.1 That the report be noted.

## 3. Background information

3.1 The Council's scheme of delegation specifies clearly the categories of applications that may be determined by officers. Where officers determine applications under delegated powers an officer report is completed and in accordance with best practice the report and decision notice are placed on the website. As set out in the Planning Protocol 2014 the decisions taken under delegated powers are to be reported monthly to the Planning Sub Committee. The attached schedule shows those decisions taken.

## Haringey Council

4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
4.1 Application details are available to view, print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.
4.2 The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5504, 9.00am-5.00pm Monday to Friday.

# APPLICATIONS DECIDED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS BETWEEN 01/03/2015 AND 30/04/2015 


#### Abstract

BACKGROUND PAPERS

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


The planning staff and planning application case files are located at 6th Floor, River Park House, Wood Green, London, N22 8HQ. Applications can be inspected at those offices 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday. Case Officers will not be available without appointment.

In addition application case files are available to view print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website:
www.haringey.gov.uk
From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.

The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 1478, 9.00am - 5.00pm, Monday - Friday.

Please see Application type codes below which have been added for your information within each Ward:

Application Type codes:

| ADV | Advertisement Consent | GTD | Grant permission |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CAC | Conservation Area Consent | REF | Refuse permission |
| CLDE | Certificate of Lawfulness (Existing) | NOT DEV | Permission not required - Not Development |
| CLUP | Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) | PERM DEV | Permission not required - Permitted |
| COND | Variation of Condition | PERM REQ | Development |
| EXTP | Replace an Extant Planning Permission | RNO | Permission required |
| FUL | Full Planning Permission | ROB | Raise No Objection |
| FULM | Full Planning Permission (Major) |  |  |
| LBC | Listed Building Consent |  |  |
| LCD | Councils Own Development |  |  |
| LCDM | (Major) Councils Own Development |  |  |
| NON | Non-Material Amendments |  |  |
| OBS | Observations to Other Borough |  |  |
| OUT | Outline Planning Permission |  |  |
| OUTM | Outline Planning Permission (Major) |  |  |
| REN | Renewal of Time Limited Permission |  |  |
| RES | Approval of Details |  |  |
| TEL | Telecom Development under GDO |  |  |
| TPO | Tree Preservation Order application works |  |  |

## Recomendation Type codes:

## WARD: Alexandra

| ADV Applications Decided: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3001 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 125 Alexandra Park Road N22 7UN |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of $1 \times$ internally illuminated fascia sign |  |  |  |  |

## CLUP Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0553 | Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 52 The Avenue N10 2QL |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for erection of single storey rear extension of 3m. |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0622 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM REQ |  | Decision Date: |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Location: } & 90 \text { Rosebery Road N10 2LA } \\ \text { Proposal: } & \text { Certificate of lawfulness for demolition of existing single garage, erection of new single garage with }\end{array}$ widened driveway.

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0743 | Officer: Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: 29/04/2015 |

Location: $\quad 30$ Bidwell Gardens N11 2AU
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for hip to gable end and dormer roof extension with rooflights to front roof slope
FUL Applications Decided: 32

| Application No: | HGY/2014/1989 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 02/03/2015 |  |
| Location: | 81 The Avenue N10 2QG |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Loft conversion with erection of rear/side dormer extensions |  |  |  |





Application No:
Decision: REF
Location: $\quad 188$ Albert Road N22 7AH
Proposal: Formation of part additional floor to create a further flat

Application No:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Decision: } & \text { GTD } \\ \text { Location: } & 12 A \text { Curzon Road N10 2RA }\end{array}$
Proposal: Construction of single storey rear extension and demolition of external boiler cupboard.

Decision:
REF

Officer: Abiola Oloyede
Decision Date: 23/03/2015
69 Alexandra Park Road N10 2DG
Erection of second floor extension to form 2 bedrooms (householder application)

HGY/2015/0260
Officer: Anthony Traub
Decision Date: 24/03/2015 replacement of existing Velux roof windows with new in new position to front elevation

HGY/2015/0302
Officer: Valerie Okeiyi
Decision Date: 26/03/2015
Location: $\quad 46$ Grasmere Road N10 2DJ
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and internal alterations to the kitchen

Application No:
Decision:
14 Cranbourne Road N10 2BT
Formation of loft extension and dormer to existing roof space (householder application)

HGY/2015/0343
GTD
1 Parham Way N10 2AT elevation, flue for woodburning stove and garden wall rebuilt.

HGY/2015/0376
Officer: Adam Flynn
Decision Date: 30/03/2015 roof light to outrigger roof slope.


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0687 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 29/04/2015 |
| Location: | Upper Flat 137 Muswell Avenue N10 2EN |  |  |
| Proposal: | Refurbishment of property to include a loft conversion and rear dormer extension and replacing rear window to the kitchen with a juliet balcony |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0692 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 29/04/2015 |
| Location: | 55 Curzon Road N10 2RB |  |  |
| Proposal: | Removal and replacement of existing conservatory |  |  |

NON Applications Decided: 2

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0843 Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 14/04/2015 |
| Location: | Flat A 53 Palace Gates Road N22 7BW |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2013/0616 to alter external surface, reduce door width and re-position, insert rooflight and position of outbuilding. |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0900 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 131 Dukes Avenue N10 2QD |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of plan height by 65 mm extend dormer by 85 mm , removal cheek cladding | ing permission HGY/2014/0240 of stud wall from loft bedroom and | crease dormer mend dormer |

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Bounds Green

## CLDE Applications Decided: 2



## CLUP Applications Decided: 4

Application No: HGY/2014/3346 Officer: Malachy McGovern
Decision: PERM DEV Decision Date: 09/03/2015
Location: $\quad 35$ Torrington Gardens N11 2AB
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for conversion of loft and erection of rear dormer extenion with juliet balcony and a ground floor rear extension and roof lights to front roof slope


Officer: Tobias Finlayson
Decision Date: 17/03/2015
40 Durnsford Road N11 2EH front rooflights.
HGY/2015/0461 Officer: Sarah Madondo
PERM DEV
21 Marlborough Road N22 8NB
Certificate of lawfulness for creation of a new rear and side single storey extension

HGY/2015/0585
Decision Date: 22/04/2015

| London Borough of Haringey |  | Page 158 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0033 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 11/03/2015 |
| Location: | 111 Myddleton Road N22 8NE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use from office to residential studio flat |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0076 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 05/03/2015 |
| Location: | 121 Whittington Road N22 8YR |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Conversion of a single dwelling house to form 1 bed flat on the ground floor and a 3 bed flat on first and second floor |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0128 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 103 Nightingale Road N22 8PT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement uPVC sash windows to front bay window and replacement uPVC rear window and rear door to ground floor flat (amended description) |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0144 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 16/03/2015 |
| Location: | 103 Whittington Road N22 8YR |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Removal of existing utility room, removal of existing dilapidated boundary fencing, construction of a single storey extension and reconstruct exterior paving and out door area |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0242 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 21 Herbert Road N11 2QN |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of roof and first floor rear extensions with new and amended windows in the existing house (householder application) |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0389 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 95 Myddleton Road N22 8NE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of loft conversion with rear dormer |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0414 | Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 10 Brownlow Road N11 2DE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Retrospective application to retain 9no. studio flats within a house previously used as HMO (house in multiple occupation) |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0456 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | Flat B 10 Cheshire Road N22 8JJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer plus 2no. roof lights to front roof |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0459 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | Flat A 10 Cheshire Road N22 8JJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of rear ground floor extens | o ground | oor flat |  |



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0470 Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 17/03/2015 |
| Location: | 111 Whittington Road N22 8YR |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/1412 to reduce proposed footprint and height of window openings, and change proposed material finish to brick throughout |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0494 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 1A Clarence Road N22 8PG |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2013/0575 to insert first and second floor obscure glazed windows to rear elevation |  |  |

## PNE Applications Decided: 3


$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Location: } & 59 \text { Durnsford Road N11 2EP } \\ \text { Proposal: } & \text { Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by } 6 \mathrm{~m}, \text { for }\end{array}$ which the maximum height would be 2.95 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.95 m
Application No: HGY/2015/0775 Officer: Valerie Okeiyi

Decision: PN REFUSED Decision Date: 15/04/2015
Location: $\quad 27$ Torrington Gardens N11 2AB
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.11 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.86 m
TEL Applications Decided: 1
Application No: HGY/2015/0041

Officer: Malachy McGovern
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 03/03/2015
Location: Thomas Hardy House Commerce Road N22 8EF
Proposal: Proposed rooftop telecommunications installation upgrade and associated works

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Bruce Grove

## CLDE Applications Decided: 7

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0291 | Officer: Anthony Traub |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: 26/03/2015 |
| Location: | 120 Philip Lane N15 4JL |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for use of property as $3 \times$ residential flats (C3) (certificate of lawfulness for an <br> existing use) |  |



| CLUP Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0243 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 83 Clonmell Road N17 6JT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for formation of rear dormer and insertion of two front rooflights |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0327 | Officer: | Paul Roberts |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 58 Gloucester Road N17 6DH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion and formation of rear dormer |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0393 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Gloucester Road N17 6DH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for roof | on to a te | raced house |  |

## FUL Applications Decided: 10



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0176 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 42 Gloucester Road N 17 6DH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Second floor addition to rear extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0262 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 10 Radley Road N17 6RL |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of loft conversion with rear dormer |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0412 | Officer: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | $02 / 04 / 2015$ |


| Location: | 84 Bruce Grove N17 6UZ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Formation of loft conversion including erection of dormer extension to main rear roof, installation of two <br> rooflights in existing front roof slope |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0489 | Officer: Valerie Okeiyi |
| Decision: | REF |  |
| Location: | 2 Drapers Road N17 6PZ |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of windows and doors |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0491 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 3 Drapers Road N17 6PZ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of windows and doors |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0575 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 12 Downhills Avenue N17 6LG |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Construction of single storey rear extension (householder application) |  |  |  |

LCD Applications Decided: 1
Application No: HGY/2015/0295 Officer: William Story

Decision: GTD Decision Date: 08/04/2015
Location: Millicent Fawcett Court Pembury Road N17 6SU
Proposal: New portcullis style entrance doors and glazed screens with controlled door entry system and security railings where required to 5 No common entrance areas

PNC Applications Decided: 1
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Application No: } & \text { HGY/2015/0257 } & \text { Officer: William Story } & \\ \text { Decision: } & \text { PN REFUSED } & & \text { Decision Date: 27/03/2015 }\end{array}$
Location: 99A Arnold Road N15 4JQ
Proposal: Prior approval for change of use from B1 (a) (offices) to C3 (dwelling house)
PNE Applications Decided: 2

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0398 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ |  | Decision Date: $26 / 03 / 2015$ |


| Location: | 26 Lordsmead Road N17 6EY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.5 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0776 | Officer: | Eoin Concannon |  |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ |  | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Location: | 92 Gloucester Road N17 6DJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.7 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |  |


| Applications Decided: 2 |  | Officer: Tobias Finlayson |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0200 |  |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | Tottenham Magistrates Court Lordship Lane N17 6RT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include felling as close to ground level as possible and treating of stump of 1 x London Plane tree |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0545 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 15/04/2015 |
| Location: | 24 Dongola Road N17 6EE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include reduction by 2.0 m on all aspects to $1 \times$ Lime tree |  |  |  |

[^1]| Application No: | HGY/2015/0208 | Officer: | Tobias Finlay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 16 Gladwell Road N8 9AA |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing roof extension. |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0444 | Officer: | William Story |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 09/04/2015 |
| Location: | 52 Oakfield Court Haslemer | 8 9QY |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Installation of new windows (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0694 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 30/04/2015 |
| Location: | 3C Wolseley Road N8 8RR |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Use of property as a flat (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) |  |  |  |  |

CLUP Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0439 | Officer: William Story |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: 08/04/2015 |

Location: 6 Briston Grove N8 9EX
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for formation of dormer extension

| Applications Decided: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0383 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 41 Mount View Road N4 4SS |  |  |
| Proposal: | Section 73 application to amend drawing numbers included in planning permission HGY/2014/2342 to the following: 2067-P-001B, 002A, 003A, 004B, 005B, 006, 2067-E-001, 002A |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0653 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | Jameson Lodge 58 Shepherds Hill N6 5RW |  |  |
| Proposal: | Variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) attached to planning permission HGY/2011/2016 in order to add third floor rear terrace |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0654 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | Jameson Lodge 58 Shepherds Hill N6 5RW |  |  |
| Proposal: | Variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) attached to planning permission HGY/2011/2016 in order to extend front third floor flank wall by 1265 mm to balance building and allow for second bedroom |  |  |

## FUL Applications Decided: 28

Application No: HGY/2014/2542 Officer: Tobias Finlayson
Decision: GTD
Decision Date: 02/04/2015
Location: $\quad 39+41$ Landrock Road N8 9HR
Proposal: Minor material amendments to consent reference HGY/2012/0568 to include revised ground floor extension rooflights, elimination of gap between ground floor roof construction and first floor bay floor construction, extended soffit at south-facing sliding patio doors and windows and front garden bicycle stores.




| Application No: | HGY/2014/2812 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 02/03/2015 |
| Location: | Land rear of 27-47 Cecile Park N8 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2012/1705 for relocation of Unit 3 (of 4) 1950mm East of approved and height increase of 1100 mm above approved |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0641 Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | Garton House 119 Hornsey Lane N6 5XB |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/2892 for design change to window type I (i). |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0828 Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 42 Weston Park N8 9TJ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/3474 to make alterations to door and windows of shed |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0845 Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 47 Priory Gardens N6 5QU |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following grant of planning permission HGY/2012/1135 for new diagonal side door, roof variation to overhanging diagonal door and removal of water storage tank and higher retaining wall |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0886 Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/04/2015 |
| Location: | 165 Tottenham Lane N8 9BY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2013/1984 to alter cladding to upper screen from blue/grey brickwork to render to a similar colour. |  |  |

## PND Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0738 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ |  | Decision Date: 09/04/2015 |

Location: St Gildas Catholic Junior School Oakington Way N8 9EP
Proposal: Demolition of one single storey portakabin incorporating three classrooms
RES Applications Decided: 10



Proposal: $\quad$| Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (construction management plan incorporating construction |
| :--- |
| logistics plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/1818. |

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0662 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | 159 Tottenham Lane N8 9BT |  |  |  |


| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (Method Statement) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0484 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0786 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |
| Location: | 159 Tottenham Lane N8 9BT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 3 (Details of facing materials) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0484 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0787 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |

Location: 159 Tottenham Lane N8 9BT

Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 11 (Considerate Constructors Scheme certificate and dust management) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0484

TPO Applications Decided: 7

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3045 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern | Decision Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 31/03/2015 |  |  |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  |  |
| Location: | 10 Cecile Park N8 9AS |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include felling to ground level of $1 \times$ Crack Willow Tree |  |  |  |



Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Fortis Green

CLUP Applications Decided: 4

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0118 | Officer: | William Story | Decision Date: | 10/03/2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | 40 Twyford Avenue N2 9NL |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for hip to gable loft conversion and rear dormer. |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0202 | Officer: | Malachy McG | ern |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 150 Fortis Green N10 3PA |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for use | ment and | round floor as | 1 (day nursery) |  |





| Application No: | HGY/2015/0700 | Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 29/04/2015 |
| Location: | 18 Tetherdown N10 1NB |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Enlargement of existing window to side elevation to property |  |  |  |

PNE Applications Decided: 1
Application No: HGY/2015/0300 Officer: Gareth Prosser

Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 17/03/2015
Location: $\quad 5$ Woodside Avenue N6 4SP
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5.8 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m
RES Applications Decided: 2

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0173 | Officer: Aaron Lau |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: 17/03/2015 |

Location: $\quad 56$ Muswell Hill N10 3ST
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 13 (delivery and servicing plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2069

Application No: HGY/2015/0499 Officer: Valerie Okeiy
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 14/04/2015
Location: Flat 229 Kings Avenue N10 1PA
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 3 (privacy screen) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2237

## TPO Applications Decided: 4



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0501 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 14/04/2015 |
| Location: | 20 Birchwood Avenue N10 3BE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include crown reduce to previous points (3m reduction) to $1 \times$ Ash tree |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0588 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 22/04/2015 |
| Location: | 8 Southern Road N2 9LE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include crown reduce by 1.5 m to previous points of $1 \times$ Oak tree |  |  |  |

## WARD: Harringay

ADV Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0279 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |  |
| Location: | Wilmott House Hampden Road N8 0HG |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of $1 \times$ non-illuminated PVC banner measuring $9 \mathrm{~m} \times 3 \mathrm{~m}$ |  |  |  |


| CLDE Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3436 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 4 Endymion Road N4 1EE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Conversion of upper floor Flat No. 3 into an additional flat forming Flat No. 4 (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0287 | Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | NOT DEV |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 543 Green Lanes N8 0RL |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for use of property as five residential flats |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0440 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Location: | 51 Hewitt Road N8 0BS |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Use of property as 2 x two bed self-contained flats (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) |  |  |  |

CLUP Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0388 | Officer: Malachy McGovern | Decision Date: 02/04/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  |
| Location: | 50 Beresford Road N8 0AJ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for erection of L-shaped loft conversion with installation of two roof lights to the <br> front roof slope |  |  |

## FUL Applications Decided: 27

| Application No: | HGY/2014/2911 | Officer: Samuel Uff |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: $16 / 04 / 2015$ |  |
| Location: | Flat 271 Raleigh Road N8 0JD |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of rear roof extension and insersion of three velux rooflights to create loft conversion to flat |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2014/2940 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  | 03/03/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |  |  |
| Location: | 14A Willoughby Road N8 0JJ |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Roof extension for five new units with new hydraulic lift system |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3388 | Officer: | Robert Smith |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 89 Mattison Road N4 1BQ |  |  |  |  |

Proposal: Conversion of loft space to form habitable room including a rear facing dormer
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3433 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 05/03/2015 |
| Location: | 120 Allison Road N8 OAS |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey side and part single / part two storey rear extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0049 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |
| Location: | 40A Duckett Road N4 1BN |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey rear extension to ground floor garden flat |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0069 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 05/03/2015 |
| Location: | 50A Park Road N15 3HR |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use from store to D1 Day Nursery, including front extension, mezzanine extension and roof lights |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0082 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 |
| Location: | 27 Frobisher Road N8 0QT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey extension to rear and side of the property |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0161 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 13/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Endymion Road N4 1EE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of five white painted timber sash windows with new white PVC double gloved sliding sash windows of similar style. |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0204 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 26/03/2015 |
| Location: | 5 Alfoxton Avenue N15 3DD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use of existing ground floor mini-cab office (Sui Generis) to a self-contained flat (C3) incorporating external alterations to the front and side elevations |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0214 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 111A Pemberton Road N4 1AY |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Renovation, reconfiguring and replacing of windows and erection of single storey ground floor extensio to the rear of the property |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0216 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 19/03/2015 |
| Location: | 93 Turnpike Lane N8 ODY |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a second floor single storey rear extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0222 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | 53 Pemberton Road N4 1AX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Retrospective planning applic | e interna | ayout alterations to existing self-c | ained flats |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0285 | Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 37 Warham Road N4 1AR |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a conservatory to the rear of the property |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0312 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 1A Cavendish Road N4 1RP |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of first floor extension. |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0344 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 31/03/2015 |
| Location: | 12 Endymion Road N4 1EE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of lower ground floor rear extension, part rear extension at second and third floor and loft conversion with enlarged rear dormer |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0353 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 25 Effingham Road N8 0AA |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of ground floor rear extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0370 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 427 Green Lanes N4 1EY |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of second floor rear extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0371 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 7 Seymour Road N8 0BJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of side return ground floor extension with pitched roof and 3 roof windows |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0387 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 50 Beresford Road N8 0AJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Construction of single storey rear and side infill extension with pitched roof and roof lights, following the demolition of existing conservatory |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0425 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | Upper Flat 50 Raleigh Road N8 OHY |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Proposed loft conversion with a rear dormer and two velux windows to the front slope |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0436 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | 180 Wightman Road N8 OBT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey kitchen | on to rea |  |  |



| LCD Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/2654 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 180 Wightman Road N8 OBT |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement PVCu Windows and Doors |  |  |  |  |

NON Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0139 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |

Location: $\quad 571$ Green Lanes N8 0RL
Proposal: Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/0083 in order to move entrance of the shopfront so that it is central to the commercial unit.


## PNC Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0129 | Officer: William Story |  | 11/03/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PN REFUSED |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | Offices at Rear 459 West Green Road N15 3PW |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for change of use from B1 (office) to C3 (dwellinghouse) |  |  |  |

RES Applications Decided: 3


| Location: | Rear of 447A Green Lanes N4 1HA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (storage of refuse) attached to Appeal reference |
|  | APP/Y5420/A/13/2191748, original planning reference HGY/2012/0361. |

Total Applications Decided for Ward: 40

## WARD: Highgate

## ADV Applications Decided: 8

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0109 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning | Decision Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  |  |
| Location: | Land adjacent to 497 | Archway Road N6 4HX |  |  |
| Proposal: | Internally illuminated poster display replacing old traditional billboard |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0154 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | Field House 9 Bishopswood Road N6 4PD |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of freestanding sign to stand on grassed area | ea in front of Field House. |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0155 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | 5 Bishopswood Road N6 4NY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of $2 x$ freestanding signs to stand on grassed | d area in front of the Mills Centre | trance. |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0156 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | The Mallinson Sports Centre Bishopswood Road | N6 4PD |  |
| Proposal: | Display of freestanding sign to stand on grassed area | ea in front of the Mallinson Sports | ntre. |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0157 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | Caen Wood Hall Hampstead Lane N6 4SA |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of wall mounted sign. |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0158 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | 7 Bishopswood Road N6 4NY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of freestanding sign to stand in garden to fro | ont of building. |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0430 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Location: | 232 Archway Road N6 5AX |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of 1 x externally illuminated fascia sign |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0577 Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 513 Archway Road N6 4HX |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of 2no. Wave Signs (Illuminated), 2no. Blad (Non-illuminated), 2no. End Cap Signs (Non-illumin (Re-consultation due to amended proposal descript | de Signs (Illuminated), 4no. Koala nated) \& 8no. Pump Number Signs tion) | gns <br> Non-illumina |

## CLDE Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0223 Officer: Valerie Okeiyi

Decision: GTD Decision Date: 20/03/2015
Location: 213 Archway Road N6 5BN
Proposal: Use of existing flat roof on top of three storey side extension as a roof terrace (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use)

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0562 | Officer: William Story |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Location: | 4 Gaskell Road N6 4EB |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for rear extension and internal alterations. |  |  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 23

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3415 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 16/03/2015 |
| Location: | 12 Broadlands Road N6 4AN |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Repairs and restoration to front elevation stone work, front portico and front steps |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3556 | Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 09/03/2015 |


| Location: | 7 Holmesdale Road N6 5TH |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Loft extension with the addition of a rear facing dormer window, three rooflights and terrace |




LBC Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0112 Officer: Gareth Prosser |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: 09/03/2015 |
| Location: | 41 North Road N6 4BE |  |
| Proposal: | Listed building consent for the replacement of existing sash windows with double glazed sash window |  |


NON Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0570 Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 27/03/2015 |
| Location: | Flat 140 Langdon Park Road N6 5QG |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/2485 to replace an existing window with a French door at ground floor level |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0580 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Location: | Ridgefield Courtenay Avenue N6 4LP |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2013/2035 to alter Michelmersh red bricks to HG Matthews red bricks (Hayes Blend) |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0657 Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/04/2015 |
| Location: | Ridgefield Courtenay Avenue N6 4LP |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of pla specification and pediment design. | ing permission HGY/2013/0131 to | Iter roof tile |

RES Applications Decided: 16

| Application No: | HGY/2013/2212 | Officer: Valerie Okeiyi |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 13/04/2015 |
| Location: | Furnival House 50 Cholmeley Park N6 5EW |  |  |  |

Proposal: Approval of Details pursuant to Condition 2A (entrance hall, existing and new stair core) 2B (sections of new cornices, architraves and mouldings) 2C (Sections showing relationship of new partitions to ground floor decorative ceilings, and reflected ceiling plan showing relocated roof lights) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1148
Application No: HGY/2014/3241 Officer: Valerie Okeiyi
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 17/04/2015
Location: R/O 440 Archway Road N6 4JH
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 7 (site investigation) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/1857

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3259 | Officer: Abiola Oloyede |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |

Location: 22 Sheldon Avenue N6 4JT
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 4 (details of proposed hard and soft landscaping) attached to planning permission HGY/2012/0884



## TPO Applications Decided: 4

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3255 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | NOT DET |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 54 North Hill N6 4RH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include felling as close to ground level as possible and stump treatment of $1 \times$ x Hornbeam <br> tree | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0536 |  | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  |  |

Proposal: $\quad$ Tree works to include reduction up to 2-3 and removal of low bent limb of $1 \times$ Red Oak Tree

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0660 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | 6A Church Road N6 4QT |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to remove deadwood, judiciously and evenly thin crown density by $15-20 \%$, raise lower crown skirt by $1.5-2 \mathrm{~m}$ of 1 x Oak tree and remove deadwood, thin crown density by $15-20 \%$ remove epicomic growth throughout crown and judiciously reduce lateral branches back of 1x Oak tree |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0666 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | 41 Sheldon Avenue N6 4JP |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include thin by $25 \%$ and reduce | eral and bilateral growths by 20 | 1 x Birch tree |



| FLEX Applications Decided: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0851 | Officer: Fortune Gumbo |
| Decision: | FLEXGTD |  |
| Location: | 78 High Street N8 7NU |  |
| Proposal: | Flexible Change of use under Class D of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted <br> Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013 starting from 18/12/2013: Existing Use Class A1 - <br>  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 9

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3528 | Officer: William Story |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 266 A Ferme Park Road N8 9BL |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of ground floor rear extension and internal alterations |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0064 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 252A Ferme Park Road N8 9BN |  |  |

Proposal: Formation of rear dormer and insertion of five velux roof lights to create a loft conversion

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0125 | Officer: Adam Flynn |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 43 Elder Avenue N8 8PS |  |  |
| Proposal: | Insertion of 3 front rooflights |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0311 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 11 Tottenham Lane N8 9DP |  |  |

Proposal: Demolish existing buildings on site and provide new storage buildings, relocating canteen, and improving logistics around the site including new surfacing, fencing and parking arrangements.

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0460
Officer: Robbie McNaugher
Decision Date: 10/04/2015
Location: 19 High Street N8 7QB
Proposal: Demolition of the existing structure used for storage at ground floor level and the access walkway party wall to properties at No.21. Change of use from storage to provide a new 1 bedroom flat at No. 19 with communal courtyard and access to properties at No. 21


| PNC | Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0374 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  |  |  |
| Location: | 36 Nightingale Lane N8 7QU |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for change of use of property from B1 (a) (offices) to C3 (residential) |  |  |  |  |

RES Applications Decided: 3


## WARD: Muswell Hill

| CLDE Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0286 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | $25 / 03 / 2015$ |
| Location: | 185 Cranley Gardens N10 3AG |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Construction of side and rear extensions and loft conversion (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) |  |  |  |



| COND Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0445 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 to <br> rebuild rather than retain brick walls |  |  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 20

| Application No: | HGY/2014/2640 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 11/03/2015 |

Location: 2-6 Summerland Gardens N10 3QN
Proposal: Demolition of existing 5 no. Single storey garages/workshops and the erection of 4 no. two storey houses (additional information received, all previous representations have been retained)



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0685 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson | 29/04/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 16 Leinster Road N10 3AN |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of full width ground floor rear extension |  |  |  |

## NON Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0402 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |
|  | 11/03/2015 |  |  |

Location: Land Rear of 97 Muswell Hill Broadway N10
Proposal: $\quad$ Non material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/1906 to amendment to planning of lower floor to show two bedrooms and bathroom instead of 1 bedroom, study and bathroom

## PNE Applications Decided: 3


RES Applications Decided: 21

| Application No: | HGY/2014/0818 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 17/04/2015 |
| Location: | 107-143 Muswell Hill Road N10 3HS |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to conditions 15 (hard and soft landscaping) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/1169 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3000 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 30 Muswell Hill N10 3TA |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to conditions 4 (landscaping) and 5 (boundary treatment) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/1846 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3519 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | 30 Muswell Hill N10 3TA |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition | 6 (Level | attached to planning permission | Y/2013/1846 |


| London Borough of Haringey |  | Page 193 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3575 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | 56 Muswell Hill N10 3ST |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 4 (risk assessment) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2069 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3577 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | 56 Muswell Hill N10 3ST |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (landscaping and boundary treatment) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2069 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3578 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 20/03/2015 |
| Location: | 56 Muswell Hill N10 3ST |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 7 (desktop study) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2069 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0357 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 3 (enclosures around the site boundary) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0358 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 4 (materials) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0359 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (tree protrective measures) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0360 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 7 (green roof) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0361 | Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Muswell Hill N10 3TD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 8 (construction management plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0482 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0531 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | Connaught House Connaught Gardens N10 3LH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant | 3 (mate | als) attached to planning permissio | HGY/2014/1973 |



Officer: Robbie McNaugher
Decision Date: 20/04/2015
Connaught House Connaught Gardens N10 3LH
Approval of details pursuant to condition 4 (balcony privacy screens) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/1973

HGY/2015/0533
Decision Date: 20/04/2015

Decision Date: 20/04/2015

Decision Date: 20/04/2015

Approval of details pursuant to condition 11 (Construction Management Plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/1846

HGY/2015/0668
Decision Date: 28/04/2015

Decision Date: 28/04/2015

Approval of details pursuant to condition 13 (archaeological evaluation) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2379

Officer: Aaron Lau

St Lukes Woodside Hospital Woodside Avenue N10 3JA
Approval of details pursuant to condition 14 (programme of building reporting and recording) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2379

Decision Date: 21/04/2015

Decision Date: 20/04/2015

Approval of details pursuant to condition 5 (construction management plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2379

| London Borough of Haringey <br> List of applications decided under delegated powers between | Page 195 <br> $01 / 03 / 2015$ <br> and 30/04/2015 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0193 | Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: GTD  Decision Date: <br> Location: 182 Muswell Hill Road N10 3NG   <br> Proposal: Tree works to include pollarding to previous points of $1 \times$ x Poplar tree   |  |  |  |  |

Officer: Aaron Lau
Decision Date: 17/03/2015

Proposal: $\quad$ Tree works to include pollarding to previous points of $1 \times$ Poplar tree
Total Applications Decided for Ward: 53

## WARD: Noel Park

## ADV Applications Decided: 2



## CLDE Applications Decided: 2


FUL Applications Decided: 13



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0586 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | Land rear of 108 Alexandra Road N8 OLJ |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a, single storey enclosure at the southern corner of this triangular land for storage |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0611 | Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 10 Hewitt Ave |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of rear dormer and insertion of 3 front roof windows (Householder Application) |  |  |  |  |

## LBC Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0391 Officer: Adam Flynn
Decision: REF Decision Date: 02/04/2015

Location: 9 The Broadway N22 6DS
Proposal: Listed building consent for display of $1 x$ internally illuminated fascia and projection sign

## LCD Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0408 Officer: Aaron Lau
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 07/04/2015
Location: 1-163 The Sandlings N22 6XP
Proposal: Enclosure of the existing open stairwells, lift lobbies and service areas to 6 No blocks (1-20, 1-28, 2948, 65-85, 92-122 \& 123-148). New powdercoated metal framed glazed portcullis style entrance doors and glazed screens with controlled door entry system and new powdercoated metal framed security railings to service areas as indicated on the accompanying Drawing Nos. CDH/389-007 013

NON Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0895 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: |

Location: 16 High Road N22 6BX
Proposal: Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/2443 to install 1 m high obscure glazing to existing parapet building walls and awnings to existing flat roof areas to provide all year round al fresco dining.

## PNE Applications Decided: 4

Application No: HGY/2015/0228
Officer: William Story
Decision:
PN REFUSED
Decision Date: 09/03/2015
Location: 22 Coleraine Road N8 0QL
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.7 m , and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.9 m .

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0364
Officer: Malachy McGovern
PN NOT REQ
Decision Date:
23/03/2015
Location: 44 Whymark Avenue N22 6DJ
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 2.95 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.95 m

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0474 Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: | 31/03/2015 |
| Location: | 21 Parkland Road N22 6SU |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.031 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.965 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.9 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0727 Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | PN REFUSED | Decision Date: | 23/04/2015 |
| Location: | 22 Coleraine Road N8 0QL |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.7 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.9 m |  |  |

## RES Applications Decided: 3



| TPO Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/2774 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | $31 / 03 / 2015$ |
| Location: | 98 Turnpike Lane N8 OPH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree work to include an overall canopy reduction of 2 metres to $2 \times$ horse chestnut trees |  |  |  |

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Northumberland Park

CLDE Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0407 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: 02/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 92 Tenterden Road N17 8BW |  |  |
| Proposal: | Alteration of property from a one-bed to a two bed flat |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/1080 | Officer: | Samuel Uff |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 23/04/2015 |
| Location: | 13 Worcester Avenue N17 0TU |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion |  |  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 6

| Application No: | HGY/2014/0119 Officer: Paul Roberts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 26 Lordship Lane N17 8NS |  |
| Proposal: | Installation of security gates, security bars to existing side gate and satellite dish to front of property. |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2014/2538 | Officer: | Paul Roberts |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 9 Rees House Orchard Place N17 8BL |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of existing windows with double glazed PVCu windows |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/2977 | Officer: | Neil McClellan |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 09/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 9 Heybourne Road N17 0SR |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Conversion into 3 self contained flats |  |  |  |  |



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0631 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |

Location: R/O 159 Park Lane N17 OHN
Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and construction of 3 storey building comprising 3 self-contained residential units

LCD Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0433 | Officer: Robbie McNaugher |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | 4-26 Manor Road N17 OJJ |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of existing timber framed glazed screens and doors with powdercoated metal framed <br> glazed screens and doors. New concrete entrance ramp all as indicated on the accompanying Drawing |  |
|  | No's. CDH/389-014 \& 015 |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0134 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ |  | Decision Date: | 09/03/2015 |
| Location: | Imperial House 64 Willoughby Lane N17 0SP |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Prior approval for change of use from B1 (a) offices to C3 (dwelling houses) |  |  |  |

PNE Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0919 $\quad$ Officer: Samuel Uff |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PN REFUSED | Decision Date: 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | 13 Worcester Avenue N17 0TU |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5 m, for <br> which the maximum height would be 3.1 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |

RES Applications Decided: 13



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0181 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | Vacant Land Between 17 and 34 Pretoria Road N | N17 8DX |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 7 (waste HGY/2014/1080 | storage) attached to planning per | sion |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0182 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | Vacant Land Between 17 and 34 Pretoria Road | N17 8DX |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 9 (contro HGY/2014/1080 | of construction dust) attached to | anning perm |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0183 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |
| Location: | Vacant Land Between 17 and 34 Pretoria Road | N17 8DX |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 12 (construc plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/1 | truction management plan and con $1080$ | ruction logistic |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0185 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | Vacant Land Between 17 and 34 Pretoria Road | N17 8DX |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 18 (layou food storage, cooking area and refuse storage) att | ut of facilities i.e. location of sinks, ached to planning permission HG | shhand basi 014/1080 |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0548 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | Northumberland Park House, 143 Northumberlan | d Park N17 0TR |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant condition 3 (external HGY/2015/2583 | materials) attached to planning pe | ssion refernc |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0550 Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | Vacant land between 17-34 Pretoria Road N17 | 8DX |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 11 (travel HGY/2014/1080 | plan) attached to planning permis |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0673 Officer: | Aaron Lau |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 881 High Road N17 8EY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 16 (green HGY/2012/2128 | / brown roof) attached to planning | ermission |

Total Applications Decided for Ward: 24
WARD: St Anns
CLDE Applications Decided: 2

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0549 | Officer: William Story |  | Decision Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | 16/04/2015 |  |  |
| Location: | Right Flat 46 Conway Road N15 3BA |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for conversion of loft space with rear dormer extension |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0551 Officer: William Story |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | 52 Black Boy Lane N15 3AR |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for use of property as $2 \times 2$ bed flats (certificate of lawfulness for an existing <br> use) |  |


| CLUP Applications Decided: 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3277 | Officer: | Robert Smith |  |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: |  |  |
| Location: | 84 Glenwood Road N15 3JR |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of rear dormer with roof extension over the rear outrigger, and insertion of 2 front rooflights. |  |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0072 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: 04/03/2015 |

Location: $\quad 71$ Harringay Road N15 3HU

Proposal: Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed loft conversion with dormer to main rear roof and rear extension roof with 2 roof lights to front roof slope.

Application No: HGY/2015/0116

Officer: Tobias Finlayson
Decision: PERM DEV

Decision Date: 06/03/2015
Location: 10 Warwick Gardens N4 1JF
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for erection of new side/rear extension
Application No: HGY/2015/0233 Officer: William Story

Decision:
Location: 4 Clarendon Road N15 3JX
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for rear dormer loft conversion
Application No: HGY/2015/0394 Officer: Sarah Madondo

Decision:
Location:
Proposal: Certificate of Lawfulness for dormer loft extension and kitchen side extension

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0405
Officer: Malachy McGovern
PERM DEV
Location: $\quad 95$ Chesterfield Gardens N4 1LW
Proposal: $\quad$ Certificate of lawfulness for proposed outbuilding to be used a gymnasium

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for conversion of existing loft space including dormer extensions to rear roof slope and rear out-rigger.

Application No:
HGY/2015/0587
Officer: Aaron Lau
Decision:
PERM DEV
Location: 64 Stanhope Gardens N4 1HT
Proposal: $\quad$ Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion with rear dormers

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0647 | Officer: | William Story |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |
| Location: | 48 Stanhope Gardens N4 1HT |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for rear dormer and front rooflights |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0690 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 29/04/2015 |
| Location: | 38 Falmer Road N15 5BA |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for rear loft conversion incorporating dormer structure |  |  |  |  |


| FLEX Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0564 | Officer: | Fortune Gumbo |  |
| Decision: | FLEXGTD |  | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | 1 Grand Parade |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Flexible Change Development) (A Proposed Use Cl | the Tow Order 20 | and Country Planning (General starting from 01/03/2015: Existin | mitted <br> Use Class A1 - |

FUL Applications Decided: 8

| Application No: | HGY/2014/2477 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |
| Location: | 18 Avenue Road N15 5JH |  |  |

Proposal: $\quad$ Erection of 3 storey building to provide $3 \times 1$ bedroom and $1 \times 2$ bedroom and $1 \times 3$ bedroom flats with 3

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3354 | Officer: | Malachy McGov |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 02/03/2015 |
| Location: | 95 Chesterfield Gardens N4 1LW |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of outbuilding in rear garden |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0052 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |
| Location: | 29 Grand Parade N4 1LG |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use from retail (A1) at ground floor level of No. 30 Grand Parade in order to provide additional seating area for restaurant at 29 Grand Parade, with single storey rear extension and new shop front to both premises |  |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0110 | Officer: William Story |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 09/03/2015 |
| Location: | Flat B 36 Conway Road N15 3BA |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0199 | Officer: | William Story |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: $24 / 04 / 2015$ |

Location: 116 Rutland Gardens N4 1JR
Proposal: Formation of loft conversion

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0261 Officer: | Paul Roberts | Decision Date: | 24/03/2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | REF |  |  |  |
| Location: | 136 Harringay Road N15 3HL |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of loft conversion with rear dormer |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0362 Officer: | Gareth Prosser |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |
| Location: | 77 Woodlands Park Road N15 3SB |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Proposed roof addition with dormer windows to the front \& rear with an addition of a terrace to the front. |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0598 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 23/04/2015 |
| Location: | 86 Avondale Road N15 3SH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of loft conversion with rear dormer |  |  |  |

PNE Applications Decided: 4

Application No: HGY/2015/0334
Officer: Anthony Traub
Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 19/03/2015
Location: 3 Falmer Road N15 5BA
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.4 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.5 m

Application No: HGY/2015/0597
Officer: Paul Roberts
Decision: PN NOT REQ
Decision Date: 08/04/2015
Location: 19 Falmer Road N15 5BA
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3 m , for which the maximum height would be 4 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m

Application No:
Decision: PN NOT REQ
Officer: Eoin Concannon
Decision Date: 15/04/2015
Location: 5 Falmer Road N15 5BA
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.6 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m .

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0767
Officer: Eoin Concannon

Location: $\quad 48$ Clarendon Road N15 3JX
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.303 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.80 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0637 Officer: Eoin Concannon | Decision Date: 28/04/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  |
| Location: | 432 St Anns Road N15 3JJ |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 3 (approved drawings further details of the elevation treatment) <br> attached to planning permission $\mathrm{HGY} / 2014 / 3124$. |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0638 | Officer: Eoin Concannon |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | 432 St Anns Road N15 3JJ |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 4 (refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities) attached to |  |

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Seven Sisters

CLDE Applications Decided: 2

CLUP Applications Decided: 5

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0236 | Officer: William Story |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 56 Lealand Road N15 6JS |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for formation of rear dormer |  |  |  |

Application No: HGY/2015/0263 Officer: Anthony Traub
Decision: NOT DEV Decision Date: 24/03/2015
Location: $\quad 39$ Lealand Road N15 6JS

Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for erection of rear dormer

Application No:
Decision: PERM DEV
Location: $\quad 47$ Vartry Road N15 6PR
Proposal: Erection of single storey kitchen extension.

Application No: HGY/2015/0335 Officer: Tobias Finlayson
Decision: PERM DEV Decision Date: 31/03/2015
Location: $\quad 47$ Beechfield Road N4 1PD
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion with rear dormer and 2 no. roof lights to the front roof

Application No:

## Decision:

Location: 4 Frinton Road N15 6NH
Proposal: Certificate of Lawfulness for rear dormer extension with back addition below ridge line of the existing main roof
FUL Applications Decided: 24

| Application No: | HGY/2014/2794 | Officer: | Paul Roberts |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Location: | 59A Elm Park |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | New second floor and loft conversion in connection with the use of the property as a single family dwellinghouse |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0040 | Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 02/03/2015 |
| Location: | 2nd Floor Flat C 1 Hillside Road N15 6LU |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of second floor rear roof extension to existing studio flat to form one bedroom flat, and removal of part of two chimney stacks |  |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0068 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 05/03/2015 |
| Location: | 67 Wellington Avenue N15 6AX |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of first floor rear extension plus new second-floor extension to replace existing front and rear dormers with new pitched roof over |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0074 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 05/03/2015 |
| Location: | 132 Wargrave Avenue N15 6UA |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of first floor rear extension |  |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0084 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: $05 / 03 / 2015$ |


| Location: | Florentia Clothing Village Vale Road N4 1TD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Demolition of existing security hut and the erection of new security offices |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0132 | Officer: Anthony Traub |
| Decision: | REF |  |


| Location: | 78 Wellington Avenue N15 6BB |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Proposal: | Excavation to provide basement level. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0276 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 121 Wargrave Avenue N15 6TX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | New second floor with pitched roof over, new basement and single storey rear addition with new front and rear light wells |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0305 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 27/03/2015 |
| Location: | 36 Heysham Road N15 6HL |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Creation of access to garden from rear first floor by means of external spiral staircase and landing with new doorway |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0307 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 16/04/2015 |
| Location: | 55A Oakdale Road N4 1NU |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Reduction of the width of the dormer |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0352 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 65 Ermine Road N15 6DE |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of window and back door with uPVC windows and back door |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0404 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 91 Leadale Road N15 6BJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of first floor side extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0424 | Officer: | Eoin Concannon |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | 15 High Road N15 6LT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Change of use class of existing basement and ground floor surgery to residential use class and conversion of existing building to 4 self-contained flats with proposed alterations to the basement extension |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0435 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Location: | 86-88 Fairview Road N15 6TP |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a first floor side / rear extension and retention of existing rear extensions (at 86 Fairview Road). |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0442 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 09/04/2015 |
| Location: | 11 Franklin Street N15 6QH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Demolition of existing garage and erection of two flats; extension at first and roof level of existing dwelling |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0463 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | 74 Wellington Avenue N15 6BB |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of additional storey 'Type 3' |  |  |  |



Officer: Sarah Madondo
Decision Date: 13/04/2015

Decision Date: 13/04/2015

Decision Date: 14/04/2015

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal:

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal:

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal: $\quad$ Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m .

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal:

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal:

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal:

Application No:
Decision:
Location:
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0677
Officer: Malachy McGovern
PN REFUSED
18 Hermitage Road N4 1DE
Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 2.5 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.8 m
Application No: HGY/2015/0766 Officer: William Story

Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 16/04/2015
Location: $\quad 56$ Lealand Road N15 6JS
Proposal: $\quad$ Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 2.80 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.80 m

RES Applications Decided: 1
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Application No: } & \text { HGY/2014/3080 } & \text { Officer: Anthony Traub } \\ \text { Decision: } & \text { GTD } & & \text { Decision Date: 02/04/2015 }\end{array}$
Location: South Tottenham Railway Station High Road N15 6UJ
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to conditions 1 (details of lighting columns including hoods or other light spill mitigation measures), 2 (replacement of trees) and 3 (details of railings and scheme of infill panels) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/1040

Total Applications Decided for Ward: 44

## WARD: Stroud Green

CLUP Applications Decided: 2
Application No: HGY/2015/0608 Officer: Tobias Finlayson

Decision: PERM DEV Decision Date: 23/04/2015
Location: $\quad 35$ Uplands Road N8 9NN
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for formation of rear roof extensions and insertion of front rooflight

Application No: HGY/2015/0646 Officer: William Story
Decision: PERM DEV Decision Date: 27/04/2015
Location: 33 Inderwick Road N8 9LB
Proposal: $\quad$ Certificate of Lawfulness for erection of new 3 m deep rear single storey extension to existing rear return.
FUL Applications Decided: 19
Application No: HGY/2014/3317 Officer: Tobias Finlayson

Decision: GTD Decision Date: 31/03/2015
Location: 8 Lorne Road N4 3RT
Proposal: Construction of a part single storey rear to part side infill extension and the conversion of the dwelling into two self-contained flats

Application No:
HGY/2014/3591
Officer: William Story
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 09/03/2015
Location: $\quad 17$ Mount Pleasant Villas N4 4HH
Proposal: Conversion of the existing loft space into a bedroom and en-suite bathroom, new small side dormer for the extended stairs for access and new rear dormer, new front window to match existing terrace and one new rear window.

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2015/0045
REF
Location: $\quad$ Nora Clegg House 49 Oakfield Road N4 4LH
Proposal: Construction of a new build development on the site at the rear comprising a two-storey building comprising of $2 \times 2$ bedroom residential units



| NON Applications Decided: 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0395 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 17/03/2015 |
| Location: | 8 Florence Road N4 4BU |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/2395 to combine the approved doors and window together in order to create one combined opening |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0472 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 23/03/2015 |
| Location: | 169 Mount View Road N4 4JT |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-Material amendment following grant of planning permission HGY/2014/1051 for internal alterations and enlargement of approved basement at Flat 2. |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0484 | Officer: Matthew Gunning | Decision Date: 18/03/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  |
| Location: | $20 \& 20 A$ Woodstock Road N4 3EX |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/0473 to insert roof light <br> window in the front elevation. |  |  |

PNE Applications Decided: 1
Application No: HGY/2015/0671 Officer: Tobias Finlayson

Decision: PN REFUSED Decision Date: 09/04/2015
Location: $\quad 35$ Uplands Road N8 9NN
Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 2.5 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.4 m
RES Applications Decided: 1

Application No:
Decision:
HGY/2014/3511
GTD
Location: $\quad 28$ Mount Pleasant Crescent N4 4HP
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to conditions 3 (materials) and 4 (screening) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/1500

TPO Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0447 Officer: Matthew Gunning | 09/04/2015 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  |
| Location: | 7 Uplands Road N8 9NN | Decision Date: |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include prune to shape back to the previous state, crown reduction, crown thinning by 35\% <br> to $1 \times$ Oak Tree. |  |

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Tottenham Green

ADV Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0479 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | Tottenham Hale Retail Park Broad Lane N15 4QD |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of 2 x internally illuminated fascia signs and $1 \times$ non-illuminated fascia sign. |  |  |



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0096 | Officer: | William Story |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Pembroke Road N15 4NW |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for erection of single storey rear extension |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0451 | Officer: | Valerie Okeiyi |  |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 07/04/2015 |
| Location: | 32 Brunswick Road N15 5DD |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for erection of single storey rear extension |  |  |  |  |

## FUL Applications Decided: 13



| Application No: | HGY/2015/0093 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 |
| Location: | 6 Pembroke Road N15 4NW |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single / two storey side / rear extension |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0120 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |  |
| Decision: | REF |  |  | Decision Date: | 02/04/2015 |
| Location: | 9 Ashmount Road N15 4DD |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Conversion of terraced house into three self-contained flats |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0351 | Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 16/03/2015 |
| Location: | 31 Bedford Road N15 4HA |  |  |  |  |

Proposal: Erection of new side extensions to match the footprint of original, new dormers, loft conversion and two front roof lights



## TEL Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0277 | Officer: Paul Roberts |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: $23 / 03 / 2015$ |

Location: Pavement fronting Page Green Terrace, High Road N15 5PB

Proposal: Installation of a 15 m street works pole supporting 6 no . antennas, 2 no . 300 mm dishes and 4 ground based radio equipment housing and ancillary development thereto

## TPO Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0281 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: $25 / 03 / 2015$ |  |


| Location: | 22 Talbot Road N15 4DH |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include re-pollard, clean stems and cut back suckers of $1 \times$ Lime tree |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0282 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 20 Talbot Road N15 4DH |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include re-pollard, clean stems and cut back suckers of $1 \times$ Lime tree |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0283 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 64 Grove Park Road N15 4SN |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Tree works to include reduction of canopy line back to 3.5 m all over of $1 \times$ English Oak tree |  |  |  |

Total Applications Decided for Ward: 26

## WARD: Tottenham Hale

ADV Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0175 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | REF |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 530-536 High Road N17 9SX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of 6 x internally (letters only) illuminated fascia signs |  |  |  |



## CLUP Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0196 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: 18/03/2015 |


| Location: | 17 Halefield Road N17 9XR |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for rear extension and rear dormer with two front rooflights |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0245 | Officer: | Anthony Tr |  |  |
| Decision: | NOT DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 25/03/2015 |
| Location: | 75 Lansdowne Road N17 0NN |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion with rear dormer |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/1042 | Officer: | Samuel Uff |  |  |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  |  | Decision Date: | 27/04/2015 |
| Location: | 52 Hanbury Road N17 9RJ |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion with rear dormers |  |  |  |  |


| FUL Applications Decided: | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3261 | Officer: | Neil McClellan |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |
| Location: | 28 Mafeking Road N17 9BG |  |  |  |

Proposal: Conversion of garage into habitable room, erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear / part first floor rear extension

Application No:
Decision: GTD
Officer: Malachy McGovern
Decision Date: 02/04/2015
Location: 510a High Road N17 9JF
Proposal: Retention of an A3 use at ground level, alterations to the shop front, new window and door openings at ground and first floor levels and erection of extension to create a second storey level

Application No:
Decision: GTD
Officer: Sarah Madondo
Decision Date:
15/04/2015
Location: $\quad 35$ Millmead Business Centre Mill Mead Road N17 9QU
Proposal: Construction of a mansard roof to create an additional storey for office use
Application No: HGY/2015/0663 Officer: Sarah Madondo

Decision: GTD
Officer: Sarah Madondo

Location: Flat 109-110 Vickers Court Waterside Way N17 9FT
Proposal: Temporary change of use of units 109 and 110 Vickers Court from residential (C3 Use Class) to a community centre (D1 Use Class) and retention of temporary external alterations to accommodate a new entrance and other associated works

## LCD Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2014/2683 Officer: Valerie Okeiyi

Decision: GTD Decision Date: 02/04/2015
Location: $\quad 3$ Field Cottages Fortis Green N2 9HS
Proposal: $\quad$ Replacement of Timber Windows and Doors

| NON Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0667 | Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2010/1897 to insert a condition (number 66) listing the approved plans as currently stated on the front page of the decision notice |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0675 | Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | Waterside Way N17. |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2013/1075 to alter fenestration and materials |  |  |  |

## PNC Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0591 Officer: Tobias Finlayson
Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 24/04/2015
Location: 1 Windsor Road N17 9DE
Proposal: $\quad$ Prior approval for change of use from B1 (office) to C3 (dwelling house)

## PNE Applications Decided: 4

Application No: HGY/2015/0136
Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 02/03/2015
Location: $\quad 17$ Halefield Road N17 9XR
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.8 m

Application No:
HGY/2015/0189
Officer: William Story
PN NOT REQ
Decision Date: 09/03/2015
Location: 11 Albion Road N17 9DB
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.7 m for which the maximum height would be 4 m , and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m .

Application No: HGY/2015/0227
Officer: William Story
Decision: PN NOT REQ
Decision Date: 09/03/2015
Location: 1 Langton Villas Hampden Road N17 OBA

| London Borough of Haringey P |  | Page 219 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between 01/ |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey rear extension, which would extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.9 . m and 4.8 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.4 m , and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m . (amended description) |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0679 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | PN REFUSED | Decision Date: | 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | 101 Thackeray Avenue N17 9DU |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.2 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |
| RES Applications Decided: 15 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/1669 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 20/03/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Depot Mill Mead Road N17 9QQ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 52 (method of piling foundations) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1897 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3533 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 36 (external lighting) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1897 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3534 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 57 (landscape management plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2010/1897 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3535 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 7 (hard landscaping) attached to planning permission HGY/2012/0799 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2014/3536 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to condition 12 (delivery and servicing plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2012/0799 |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0121 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 9QQ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to conditions 36 (ex HGY/2010/1897 | nal lighting scheme) attached to | ning permission |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0122 Officer: | Adam Flynn |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 24/04/2015 |
| Location: | GLS Supplies Depot Ferry Lane N17 9QQ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Approval of details pursuant to conditions 37 (acour HGY/2010/1897 | stic report) attached to planning p | mission |




Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 9 Considerate Consstructions) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0498

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0806 | Officer: | Robbie McNaugher |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: |

Location: Image House Station Road N17 9LR

Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 17 (Site Waste management Plan) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0498

Application No:
Decision: GTD

Officer: Robbie McNaugher
Decision Date: 24/04/2015

Location: Image House Station Road N17 9LR
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 16 (Archaeology) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0498

TEL Applications Decided: 1

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0329 | Officer: Aaron Lau |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 30/03/2015 |

Location: Highways Land Watermead Way
Proposal: Installation of a new 12.5 m street works pole supporting 6 no. antennas and 2 no . 300 mm dishes, 4 equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto.

## WARD: West Green

## CLDE Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: HGY/2015/0101 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: 06/03/2015 |


| Location: | 424 West Green Road N15 3PU |
| :--- | :--- |
| Proposal: | Certificate of Lawfulness for the continued use of the property as four self contained flats |



## FUL Applications Decided: 11

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3568 | Officer: William Story |  | Decision Date: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  |  |
| Location: | 27 Carlingford Road N15 3ED |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey side and rear extension to existing ground floor flat |  |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0059 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |  |
| Location: | 24 Belmont Avenue N17 6AX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Loft conversion including rear dormer and front rooflights |  |  |  |



Proposal: Erection of one bedroom single storey new build self-contained dwelling house for two persons.


## PND Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0146
Officer: Anthony Traub
Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 23/04/2015
Location: 270-274 West Green Road N15 3QR
Proposal: Prior notification for demolition of existing 2 storey building on site

## PNE Applications Decided: 4

Application No: HGY/2015/0231 Officer: Sarah Madondo
Decision: PN REFUSED Decision Date: 16/03/2015
Location: $\quad$ 167B Langham Road N15 3LP
Proposal: Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 3.0 and 6.0 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.0 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3.0 m

RES Applications Decided: 3

TEL Applications Decided: 2

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0100 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 |
| Location: | Highway Lordship Lane N17 6AA |  |  |
| Proposal: | Installation of new 15 m street works pole supporting 6 no. antennas and 2 no . 300 mm dishes, 4 no . equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto situated on land adjacent to 205 Lordship Lane |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0711 Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | PN REFUSED | Decision Date: | 30/04/2015 |
| Location: | Turnpike Lane Underground Station Green Lanes | N15 3NX |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of existing 13.8 m pole with a new 15 m and the replacement of 2 no. cabinets and developm | $m$ high street works pole supportin ment ancillary thereto | 6no. antennas |

## WARD: White Hart Lane

|  |  | ADV Applications Decided: |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0186 | Officer: | Antho |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 19/03/2015 |
| Location: | 335-337 White Hart Lane N17 7LY |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of $3 x$ internally illuminated fascia signs, $1 \times$ non-illuminated fascia sign, $1 \times$ internally illuminated acrylic sign and $3 \times$ non-illuminated vinyl / metal frame signs. |  |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0581 | Officer: | Matth |  |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  |  | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | St Georges Industrial Estate White Hart Lane N22 5QL |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Display of 1x internally illuminated totem sign |  |  |  |  |

## CLDE Applications Decided: 1

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Application No: } & \text { HGY/2015/0617 } & \text { Officer: } & \text { Eoin Concannon } \\ \text { Decision: } & \text { GTD } & \text { Decision Date: } & \text { 23/04/2015 }\end{array}$
Location: $\quad 63$ De Quincey Road N17 7DJ
Proposal: Use of property as 2 self-contained flats (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use)

| Applications Decided: 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0434 | Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | PERM REQ |  | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Location: | 17 Warkworth Road N17 7BD |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for formation of rear dormer and insertion of two front rooflights |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0547 | Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | PERM REQ |  | Decision Date: | 20/04/2015 |
| Location: | 7 Cavell Road N17 7BJ |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for formation of two storey rear extension, hip to gable loft conversion and rea dormer loft extension |  |  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 9

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0099 Officer: | William Story |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 06/03/2015 |
| Location: | 100 Henningham Road N17 7AN |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of conservatory to the rear of the property |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0102 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 09/03/2015 |
| Location: | 202 Tower Gardens Road N17 7QB |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of non-original windows with new dou single storey rear extension, installation of new stai level windows (householder application) | ble glazed timber sash to front a rcase to access the loft space and | ear, erectio stallation of |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| List of applications decided under delegated powers between 01 |  | 01/03/2015 and 30/04/2015 |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0137 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 11/03/2015 |
| Location: | 71 Rivulet Road N17 7JT |  |  |
| Proposal: | Conversion of existing 7 bedroom house into a $3 / 4$ bed house and a two bed flat |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0143 Officer: | Matthew Gunning |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 16/03/2015 |
| Location: | St Francis De Sales School Church Road N17 8AZ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of new 2.4 m high black powder coated metal post and rail Security Fencing in replacement of existing 1.6 m high metal railings to High Road elevation. |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0197 Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 78-78A Great Cambridge Road N17 8LT |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of loft floor on No's 78 \& 78A to accommodate 1 bedroom extra per dwelling. |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0198 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 18/03/2015 |
| Location: | 224 The Roundway N17 7DE |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of double storey side and rear extension, with part single storey rear extension |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0462 Officer: | Sarah Madondo |  |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 10/04/2015 |
| Location: | 13 Shobden Road N17 7PG |  |  |
| Proposal: | Formation of rear dormer \& insertion of two rooflights to front slope to create a loft conversion |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0579 Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 21/04/2015 |
| Location: | 15 Spottons Grove N17 7JB |  |  |
| Proposal: | Installation of double glazed windows and door |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0623 Officer: | Malachy McGovern |  |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 23/04/2015 |
| Location: | 35 Gospatrick Road N17 7EH |  |  |
| Proposal: | Insertion of two roof windows to rear roof pitch (householder application) |  |  |
| NON Applications Decided: 1 |  |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0506 Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | GTD | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |
| Location: | 142 Risley Avenue N17 7ER |  |  |
| Proposal: | Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2014/2773 to locate disabled batchroom inside the existing dining room, attached to the existing living room |  |  |


| Application No: | HGY/2015/0150 Officer: |  | 02/03/2015 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: |  |
| Location: | 90 Compton Crescent N17 7LD |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.8 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0493 Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 80 Flexmere Road N17 7AY |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4 m , for which the maximum height would be 3.3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0542 Officer: | Anthony Traub |  |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: | 01/04/2015 |
| Location: | 312 White Hart Lane N17 8LA |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5.5 m , for which the maximum height would be 4 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0595 Officer: | Paul Roberts |  |
| Decision: | REF | Decision Date: | 08/04/2015 |
| Location: | 1 Norfolk Avenue N15 6JX |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 4 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0678 Officer: | William Story |  |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: | 22/04/2015 |
| Location: | 116 Gospatrick Road N17 7JE |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6 m , for which the maximum height would be 4 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3 m |  |  |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0771 Officer: | Eoin Concannon |  |
| Decision: | PN NOT REQ | Decision Date: | 28/04/2015 |
| Location: | 308 White Hart Lane N17 8LA |  |  |
| Proposal: | Erection of a single storey extension which extend for which the maximum height would be 3 m and fo | seyond the rear wall of the orig $r$ which the height of the eaves w | house by 4.7 m , <br> be 2.75 m |

Total Applications Decided for Ward:

## WARD: Woodside

CLUP Applications Decided: 3

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0138 | Officer: William Story |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 12/03/2015 |

Location: $\quad 42$ Homecroft Road N22 5EL

Proposal: Erection of rear ground floor extension, formation of rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights.

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0267 | Officer: Aaron Lau |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM DEV |  | Decision Date: | 24/03/2015 |

Location: 27 Cranbrook Park N22 5NA
Proposal: $\quad$ Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion and rear dormer

| Application No: | HGY/2015/0563 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | PERM REQ | Decision Date: 20/04/2015 |  |
| Location: | 5 Sandford Avenue N22 5EJ |  |  |
| Proposal: | Certificate of lawfulness for erection of single storey rear extension and dormer to rear elevations |  |  |

FUL Applications Decided: 13

| Application No: | HGY/2014/3308 | Officer: Anthony Traub |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: 20/03/2015 |

Location: 1A Wolseley Road N22 7TW

Proposal: Raise roof by additional 1 metre to previously approved scheme HGY/2011/0995.




| LCD Applications Decided: |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Application No: | HGY/2015/0051 | Officer: | Tobias Finlayson |  |
| Decision: | GTD |  | Decision Date: | 03/03/2015 |
| Location: | 122 Station Road N22 7SX |  |  |  |
| Proposal: | Replacement of timber windows and doors |  |  |  |

## PNE Applications Decided: 1

Application No: HGY/2015/0252 Officer: William Story
Decision: PN NOT REQ Decision Date: 12/03/2015
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Location: } & 46 \text { Melrose Avenue N22 5EA } \\ \text { Proposal: } & \text { Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by } 4.5 \mathrm{~m} \text {, for }\end{array}$ which the maximum height would be 3 m and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.75 m .

## RES Applications Decided: 2

Application No: HGY/2014/1376 Officer: Aaron Lau
Decision: GTD Decision Date: 17/03/2015
Location: New River Sports Centre White Hart Lane N22 5QW
Proposal: Approval of details pursuant to condition 6 (Landscaping) attached to planning permission HGY/2014/0053
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| Report for: | Planning Sub Committee <br> Date: 1 June 2015 | Item <br> Number: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Title: | Update on major proposals |
| :--- | :--- |


| Report <br> Authorised by: | Emma Williamson |
| :--- | :--- |

Lead Officer: $\quad$ John McRory

## Ward(s) affected:

Report for Key/Non Key Decisions:
All

## 1. Describe the issue under consideration

1.1 To advise the Planning Sub Committee of major proposals that are currently in the pipeline. These are divided into those that have recently been approved; those awaiting the issue of the decision notice following a committee resolution; applications that have been submitted and are awaiting determination; and proposals which are the being discussed at the pre-application stage.

## 2. Recommendations

2.1 That the report be noted.

## 3. Background information

3.1 As part of the discussions with members in the development of the Planning Protocol 2014 it became clear that members wanted be better informed about proposals for major development. Member engagement in the planning process is encouraged and supported by the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF). Haringey aims through the new protocol to achieve early member engagement at the pre-application stage through formal briefings on major schemes. The aim of the schedule attached to this report is to provide information

## Page 232

## Haringey Council

on major proposals so that members are better informed and can seek further information regarding the proposed development as necessary.
4. Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985
4.1 Application details are available to view, print and download free of charge via the Haringey Council website: www.haringey.gov.uk. From the homepage follow the links to 'planning' and 'view planning applications' to find the application search facility. Enter the application reference number or site address to retrieve the case details.
4.2 The Development Management Support Team can give further advice and can be contacted on 0208489 5504, 9.00am-5.00pm Monday to Friday.

| SITES THAT HAVE BEEN TO COMMITTEE BUT ARE AWAITING ISSUE OF DECISION NOTICE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Description | Timescales/comments | Case Officer | Manager |
| St Ann's Hospital Site | Redevelopment of part of the former hospital site (8.72ha) to provide residential and new mental health building. The application includes new build and re-use of existing buildings. | Hybrid application consisting of full planning application for part of the site within the Conservation Area and an outline application for the remainder of the site. Planning Performance Agreement in place with agreed timelines. <br> Approved at the planning committee on March 16 2015. PPA deadline extended to end of May. <br> S. 106 legal agreement currently being negotiated. | Anthony Traub | John McRory |
| APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED TO BE DECIDED |  |  |  |  |
| St Ann's Police Station | 32 units (residential) in a mixture of unit sizes including $1,2 \& 3$ bed flats and 4 bed houses together with 16 parking spaces, cycle and refuse storage. The proposal will retain the former St Ann's Police station building, extend the building along Hermitage Road and convert the existing building to accommodate new flats, a new building to provide additional flats, and a mews type block of dwellinghouses to the rear | Planning application submitted on $5^{\text {th }}$ January 2015. <br> Proposal acceptable in principle. However, issues relating to design, scale and impact on locally listed building and the conservation area. Revised plans addressing these issues now received. <br> Discussions also taking place over the viability report. | Anthony Traub | John McRory |


|  | to provide family housing. | Likely to be reported to Planning subcommittee $22^{\text {nd }}$ June2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chances, 399 <br> High Road, N17 | Planning and listed building applications for the refurbishment of premises and roof extension and extension to rear to provide 23 selfcontained flats | Several pre-application meetings have taken place on - issues over design and layout of residential accommodation in relation to the exiting community use. Does not have officer support. <br> Planning application has been submitted and is now valid. Historic England object to the design of the scheme. Officers currently not in support of the scheme because of issues relating to design. <br> Likely recommendation to refuse the planning application under delegated authority. Listed Building application already received. | Robbie McNaugher | John McRory |
| 30 Muswell Hill | Section 73 for the variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/1846 in order to amend internal layouts, fenestration, rear elevation and the setting out of the building. | Decision made (subject to the signing of a 106) under delegated powers with agreement of the Chair. <br> s. 106 Legal agreement with solicitors. | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| 270-274 West <br> Green Road | Redevelopment of the site with part three part four storey building for flexible use (A1/A2/B1A/D1) on the ground floor and 10 residential units on the upper floors. | Planning application currently at consultation stage and under consideration. <br> Similar proposal for 9 flats has been refused planning permission and has been to an appeal hearing. Decision from PINS awaited. | Anthony Traub | John McRory |


| Section 73 for Hale Village | The S73 is to remove the hotel from the tower | Decision likely to be made under delegated powers shortly. | Adam Flynn | Neil McClellan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 73 for Spurs Stadium | The S73 is to provide a new basement level beneath the approved stadium in order accommodate some of the already consented car parking spaces proposed at ground floor level, as well as plant and storage areas, and amendments to the consented ground floor layout to allow for extended player changing facilities, enhanced media facilities and other associated stadium uses. No changes are proposed to the external appearance or the height, scale and mass of the consented stadium. | To be reported to committee on 22 June with a positive recommendation. No additional impacts over current approval. | Neil Mcclellan | Emma <br> Williamson |
| 49A Oxford Road, N4 | Demolition of the existing building and the erection of a 3 to 4-storey building with 132 study bedrooms contained within 22 cluster flats | No pre-application advice has been sought by the applicants. <br> Currently at consultation and the planning application currently being assessed. | Eoin Concannon | John McRory |
| 2 Chestnut Road N17 | Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/0155 to rebuild the retained facade of the west elevation and increase the new basement area. | Officers have no objection to the rebuilding of the retained facade. Application under consideration but likely recommendation to approve the scheme. | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |


| Lee Valley Techno Park | Prior approval for change of use from Class B1 (offices) to use as state funded school - under permitted development | A Grampian condition will be used for the highways works. <br> Transportation comments awaited. <br> Will be a delegated decision. | Robbie McNaugher. Soon to be allocated to Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Somerlese, Courtenay Avenue N6 | Replacement of existing dwelling with two storey detached dwelling with rooms at roof and basement levels. | The replacement dwelling is over 1000 sqm. The planning application is currently at consultation stage and is under consideration. | Aaron Lau | John McRory |
| Gisburn Mansions Tottenham Lane, N8 | Erection of new third storey and new roof to provide 12no. two bedroom flats | The planning application is currently at consultation stage and is under consideration. | Aaron Lau | John McRory |
| Section 73 for Hale Village | To keep the permission alive. The Section 96a (non material amendment) has been determined and approved as recommended. The S73 is to remove the hotel from the tower | An early decision expected on this. <br> An extension of time is required | Adam Flynn | Neil McClellan |
| IN PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS - TO BE SUBMITTED SOON |  |  |  |  |
| Beacon Lodge, 35 Eastern Road | Part demolition and part retention and extension of existing building and change of use from C2 to C3 to create 3 dwellings, together with the construction of 6 flats in a 3-storey (plus basement) building, and a detached dwelling to the rear (10 residential units total). | 2 pre-applications have taken place. <br> The proposal is acceptable in principle (officer level opinion). <br> Scheme reported to Quality Review Panel on $20^{\text {th }}$ May who is broadly supportive of the scheme. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |


|  |  | The scheme is to be presented to Members on 1 June 2015 for feedback. <br> Application to be submitted soon. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $191-201$ <br> Archway Road | Retention and enhancement to the existing building facing Archway Road -Provision of 25 new residential dwellings <br> -Provision of circa 975 sqm of mixed commercial floor space | Pre-application discussions taken place on two occasions. The scheme has been presented to panel members of the Quality Review Panel who are in general support of the scheme. <br> The scheme has been presented at a DM Forum. <br> Scheme reported to panel members of the Quality Review Panel on $20^{\text {th }}$ May 2015 who is broadly supportive of the scheme. <br> The scheme is to be presented to Members on 1 June 2015 for feedback. <br> Application to be submitted soon. | Aaron Lau | John McRory |
| 255 Lordship Lane | Erection of a four storey building consisting of 3 mixed use commercial units, 30 residential units comprising $13 \times 1$ bed units, 11 $x 2$ bed units \& $6 \times 3-4$ bed units ( 2 massing options) - includes a land swap. | 4 pre-application meetings have taken place. <br> Applicants have negotiated a land swap with the Council in order to provide a new access road as part of the scheme. <br> The applicants have been informed that the development is, (an officer level opinion), acceptable in principle but have been made aware of the regeneration aspirations of the area which includes this site and therefore policies and views are subject to change. | Malachy McGovern | John McRory |


|  |  | Scheme reported to panel members of the Quality Review Panel on $20^{\text {th }}$ May 2015 who is broadly supportive of the scheme subject to some changes in the design. <br> Scheme to be presented to Members on 1 June 2015 for feedback. <br> Application to be submitted soon. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hale Wharf | Demolition of existing structures and erection of 15 blocks of primarily residential accommodation ranging from 3 to 16 storeys and providing up to 450 dwellings with some commercial floor space, parking and retention of 3 no commercial barges. | In pre-application discussions. EIA development. <br> PPA meeting was held. <br> The developers need to speak to a transport consultant. <br> The starting point for the development is the green belt test. <br> Awaiting scoping opinion. <br> Application likely to be submitted in summer 2015. | Robbie McNaugher | Neil McClellan |
| Garage site adjacent to Hale Wharf | Demolition of existing garage and erection of a residential scheme | This application is to be submitted the same time as Hale Wharf. | Robbie McNaugher | Neil McClellan |
| Apex House | Residential led mix use scheme. 22 storeys. | Series of PPA meetings underway <br> Pre-app committee meeting was held on $10^{\text {th }}$ March. | Robbie McNaugher | Neil McClellan |


|  |  | QRP was held on the $13^{\text {th }}$ May DM Forum 27 May |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Furnival House | Change of use from hostel to residential (C3) and conversion of property into 15 residential units comprising $6 \times 3$ bed, $7 \times 2$ bed and $2 \times 1$ bed flats that will include erection of two storey rear stepped infill extension and replacement top floor structure to create new unit. Excavation of lower ground floor and new basement to accommodate leisure facilities, 11 car parking spaces in basement area and four parking spaces externally, and 15 cycle spaces. Refuse / recycling facilities and associated landscaping. | Developers want to reduce the number of units that was approved from 15 to 13. A section a S73 application to vary the scheme accordingly is to be shortly. | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| Dyne House Highgate School N6 | Demolition of the Classroom Building, Gymnasium and a redundant open air Swimming Pool. Construction of extensions in the front of and at the rear of Dyne House together with associated landscaping and improved emergency and service vehicle access. <br> Temporary Planning Consent for the duration of the construction period for the installation of temporary modular seminar rooms within one of the Quadrangles of the Island part | Although the principle of the scheme is acceptable, the scheme presented is unacceptable as it would occupy too much of the site and be of a scale, bulk and design which is excessive. <br> The applicants have been advised to produce an SPD in partnership with the Council for the site and to assist the development process of the new school. <br> Site visit has been carried out by senior officers. | Gareth Prosser | John McRory |


|  | of the Senior School Site. <br> Temporary change of use of domestic and office property outside of the School boundary to educational facilities. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Raglan Hall | Conversion of hotel into $4 \times 3$ bed, $10 \times 2$ bed, $3 \times 1$ bed and 1 studio flat (as per HGY/2003/1131 or Option 2 Change use of part of the hotel to create 11 residential flats. | Scheme acceptable in principle. Transportation issues have been addressed. Internal layout of units needs further work including the provision of balconies/terraces at rear. Wheelchair accessible units need to be explored in the scheme. Developers will commission a viability assessment if the provision of affordable units on site is not feasible. | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| IN PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS |  |  |  |  |
| 109 Fortis Green, N2 | Re-development to provide 9 residential units ( $4 \times 3$ bed, $3 \times 2$ bed and $2 \times 1$ bed) and a commercial unit for use as a local gym | Principle acceptable subject to robustly justifying loss of employment land. | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| 2 Canning Crescent, N22 (and adjoining Land) | Re-development of site to comprise a part two, part three storey building consisting of 19 dwellings with communal and private amenity space. | Principle acceptable subject to justifying loss of employment land (which has actually been vacant for a significant number of years) and design revisions. |  |  |
| 555 White Hart Lane, N17 | Demolition of two storey building \& erection of two buildings comprising office, retail, cafe \& a business conference / events centre with associated changes to vehicular crossover. | The proposal is acceptable in principle subject to more detail regarding the uses and transport issues. | Malachy McGovern | John McRory |


| Cross Lane next to Hornsey depot | Redevelopment of the site with employment space and residential units. | Principle acceptable subject to comprehensive details of design, scale and bulk. Loss of employment space would need to be justified/floorspace replaced. PPA to be negotiated. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| r/o 55 Cholmeley Park N6 | Demolition of existing building and redevelopment to re-provide health care facility and 8 residential units | Pre-application discussion has taken place. Principle may be acceptable subject to reproviding the facility for existing user group both permanently and whilst the development is built and adherence to planning policies relevant to the scheme and the Highgate Bowl. | Tobias Finlayson | John McRory |
| Coppetts Wood Hospital, Coppetts Road, N10 | Re-Development of site to provide 90 dwellings; $29 \times 1$ bed flats; $45 \times 2$ bed flats; $6 \times 3$ bed flats; $10 \times 4$ bed houses | Number of pre-application meetings held with different bidders. | Aaron Lau | John McRory |
| 123-124 High <br> Road | Conversion of upper floors from office to hotel | Supported in principle. Pre-application response sent. | Malachy McGovern | John McRory |
| 45,47,49 and 63 <br> Lawrence Road | Residential scheme for 83 dwellings ( $34 \times 1 \mathrm{~b}, 33 \times 2 \mathrm{~b}, 7 \times$ $3 b$ and $9 \times 4 b$ | Supported in principle as land use but issues with regards to loss of employment floor space and the general layout | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| 67 Lawrence Road, Tottenham, N15 | Re-development of the site for the erection of two buildings ranging from 4-6 storeys comprising of 55 residential units and associated landscaping and car parking. | Pre-application took place on $11^{\text {th }}$ July. Same issues as above. | Anthony Traub | John McRory |
| 255 Lordship Lane | 3 mixed use commercial units, 30 residential units comprising $13 \times 1$ bed units, $11 \times 2$ bed units $\& 6 \times 3-4$ bed units (2 massing options) | 3 pre-application meetings - Pre-application responses sent. Issues over the introduction of residential use into a part of the commercial uses within proximity of the site. | Malachy McGovern | John McRory |
| 12-14 High Road | Erection of a further 13 No. | Pre-app meeting held Monday 20/10/2014. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |


|  | Dwellings including the conversion |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Keston Centre | Pre-application discussion for residential scheme. | Discussion need on layout, design and transport. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| St James C of E/ <br> Cranwood <br> School | School expansion and residential development | Formal pre-application discussions have commenced and are ongoing. | Robbie McNaugher | John McRory |
| 52-68 Stamford <br> Road <br> N15 | Mixed use development including 50 dwellings and 335 sq.m. B1/B2 | First formal pre-application discussion took place on Monday October $13^{\text {th }}$. Not acceptable with loss of employment space. | Gareth Prosser | John McRory |
| Marsh Lane (replacement of Ashley Road depot) | Proposed replacement of Ashley Road Depot. | Pre-application feasibility discussions are ongoing. Planning Performance Agreement signed and meetings taking place. | Robbie McNaugher | John McRory |
| MAJOR APPLICATION CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| Furnival house, 50 Cholmeley Park | Approval of Details pursuant to Condition 2A (entrance hall, existing and new stair core) 2B (sections of new cornices, architraves and mouldings) 2C (Sections showing relationship of new partitions to ground floor decorative ceilings, and reflected ceiling plan showing relocated roof lights | On -going discussions |  | John McRory |
| Protheroe House, Chesnut Road | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 4 (landscaping) attached to planning permission HGY/2013/2465. | To be discharged | Valerie Okeiyi | John McRory |
| Unit 11, Mowlem Trading Estate | Approval of details pursuant to Condition 4 (Desktop Study - site investigation). | Applicant has agreed to partial discharge the condition. | Aaron Lau | John McRory |


| Tottenham <br> Hotspur Stadium | Conditions to be discharged relating <br> to rear boundary and drainage are <br> under discussion |  | Adam Flynn | Neil McClellan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pembroke Works | Approval of details pursuant to <br> conditions 6 (landscaping and <br> surroundings), condition 10 (desktop <br> study for uses and contaminants) <br> attached to planning permission <br> HGY/2012/1190 | Landscaping and verification details to be <br> finalised. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| 165 Tottenham <br> Lane | Approval of details pursuant to <br> condition 5 (construction <br> management plan) planning <br> permission HGY/2013/1984 | Awaiting comments from internal parties. | Aaron Lau |  |
| Hornsey Depot, <br> Hornsey Refuse <br> and Recycling <br> Centre, High <br> Street, N8 | A number of conditions have been <br> submitted, | A number of pre-commencement conditions <br> have been discharged and others awaiting <br> comments. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| St Lukes | Conditions to be submitted soon. A <br> meeting is being arranged in order to <br> set up monitoring meetings | Awaiting dates for meeting | Aaron Lau | John McRory |
| GLS Depot | A number of conditions have been <br> submitted | Several conditions have been discharged <br> and officer awaiting further information in <br> relation to other submitted applications. | Adam Flynn | John McRory |
| 173-175 <br> Willoughby <br> Lane, N17 | Use of the site as a waste depot - <br> Camden Council the applicant | Meeting to took place on 10th February to <br> discuss - advised that any such application <br> would be resisted. <br> Aaron Lau | Neil McClellan |  |
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