

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 11TH JUNE, 2018, 19.00hrs

PRESENT:

Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Sarah James, Peter Mitchell, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Preston Tabois, Sarah Williams and Sakina Chenot

195. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Noted.

196. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted from Cllr Hinchcliffe. Cllr Chenot attended as a substitute.

197. URGENT BUSINESS

There was no such business.

198. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair advised that he was a member of the Twentieth Century Society, which had submitted an objection in relation to 65-67 North Road. The Chair advised that he did not have any personal involvement with the objection.

199. MINUTES

RESOLVED

- That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 20 March 2018 be approved.

200. HGY/2017/3650 76 WOODLAND GARDENS N10 3UB

Clerks note – The Chair agreed to amend the order of business for the meeting. Agenda item 10 would be considered first, followed by item 9 and then item 8. Please note, the minutes follow the order in which they were considered during the meeting, rather than the order stated on the agenda.

The Committee considered an application for: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2-storey (with basement level) dwellinghouse.

The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- a. In response to a query around the relevant restrictions upon the committee in relation to the case, as set out in the national framework on planning and design; officers advised that the Committee was unable to impose their own design preferences when making a decision, but should be respectful to features that contribute the wider street scene.
- b. In response to a question, officers advised that a duplicate application had been submitted for this site which was due be heard before 5th July. Officers advised that because the application had gone to an appeal for non-determination, which could take up to six months, the duplicate application was a contingency aimed at speeding up the process.
- c. In response to a question, officers acknowledged that as a semi-detached property, the proposed basement carried a higher degree of risk due to the party wall. However, the structural engineer had no objections at this stage and more detailed assessment would be required for building regulations.
- d. Officers also acknowledged that the report recommended that permitted development rights be restricted in order to maintain openness around the property. Officers added that although retention of the existing building was preferred by officers, it could not be mandated as the property already had permitted development rights for demolition.

Farrol Goldblatt and David Godden spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Godden advised that he objected to the site due its poor design quality, characterising the design as a brick box with aluminium windows. It was asserted that the proposals did not meet a high standard of design, nor contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area, as was required by the Council's own planning policies.

The proposal related to a semi- detached property and the objectors were concerned that the design effectively grafted an unsuitable looking design onto an existing property. In further contrast to the Council's own planning policies, this did not interact positively with existing structures. It was suggested that design standards needed to be high in order to maintain the Edwardian character of the street. There had been no demolitions in the street and the street-scape had remained the same since it was built.

The objectors commented that the concerns of the community had been ignored and that there had been a total lack of consultation with neighbouring properties.

Mr Goldblatt advised the Committee that he owned the adjoining property with the site and opposed the application, due to the poor quality of design and the impact of the development within the residential street. It was suggested that 76 & 78 Woodland Gardens were unique as the only semi-detached properties in the street. Furthermore, the site was considered to be structurally sound and did not pose a threat. The objector acknowledged that the property was not in a good state at present but suggested that any design should be in keeping with the wider architectural style of the street.

Cllr Connor and Cllr Ogiehor also spoke in objection to the application.

Cllr Ogiehor suggested that the design was completely out of keeping with the distinct character of the wider area and also raised concerns that there had been a total lack of consultation. Cllr Ogiehor urged that any renovation should maintain the original architectural features and was concerned that acceptance of this application would set a worrying precedent. The Committee was urged to reject the application.

Cllr Connor advised that she was addressing the Committee on behalf of local residents who were concerned with the application. Cllr Connor requested that the Committee reject the application. However, if the Committee was to approve the application, the following conditions should be implemented:

- a. That the window sizes be reduced to match those of the neighbouring properties.
- b. That the property be rebuilt in a manner fitting to its Edwardian design, and in support of the distinctiveness of the local area.
- c. That a quantitative ground quality assessment be undertaken in respect of the proposed basement.

The Committee had a number of questions in relation to the points raised by the objectors:

- a. In response to a question, officers advised that notification of demolition could be carried out without planning permission. Officers agreed that retention would be preferable to demolition but cautioned that there was no facility to insist on this under planning legislation.
- b. In response to a further question, officers advised that a basement impact assessment would be required at the building regulations stage.
- c. The Committee sought clarification on the types of conditions that objectors would seek if planning permission was granted. In response, the objectors emphasised the uniformity of the existing street scape and urged that it should be maintained. Mr Godden suggested that any conditions should focus on strictly controlling the building materials used, particularly in regards to the window frames and wider architectural detailing.

Speaking in favour of the application were Rod MacArthur, the architect, and Jason Evans, the owner of 76 Woodland Gardens.

The applicant's representative informed the Committee that an application was originally submitted in May 2017 and officers had failed to come back to the applicant within the agreed timelines, hence the application for non-determination. The Committee heard that although 77 objections had been received, around 85% of local residents have not objected to the application and it was suggested that the opposition was a small vocal minority.

The applicant's representative advised that he had received a clear brief to be sympathetic to the character of the local area and he believed that the building plans achieved this. The Committee was also advised that the property did not lie within a

conservation area and therefore objections based on preserving architectural uniformity should have no bearing on the decision.

The applicant informed the Committee that the property had been on the market for three years prior to his purchasing of it, and that this was because of several instances where financing had fallen through on receipt of the building inspector's report. It was also suggested that the applicant had received advice from several contractors that the building was beyond economic repair, which had also been confirmed by a structural engineer. The applicant also informed the Committee that a number of changes had been made to the plans, in light of some of the objections raised by the community. Furthermore, this was the second application submitted as the first was withdrawn on the advice of Council officers.

In response to a question from the Committee about the changes made when submitting the second application, the applicant advised that a number of changes were made to the front elevation to make the design more in keeping with original Edwardian detailing. Alterations were also made to the main window bay.

Cllr Mitchell proposed an amended resolution to that outlined in the report. Cllr Cawley-Harrison seconded the amended resolution. The resolution was to advise the Planning Inspectorate that had the application not been appealed on grounds of non-determination, the development described in the report and submitted plans, would have been REFUSED PLANNING PERMISSION application on the grounds that it failed to comply with policy DM1, as it failed to maintain the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.

Following a vote, with 7 in favour, 4 against and no abstentions or refusals, it was

RESOLVED

That had the application not been appealed on grounds of non-determination, the development described in the report and submitted plans, would have been REFUSED PLANNING PERMISSION application on the grounds that its detailed design, scale and appearance, would not relate positively to neighbouring buildings and would harm the character and appearance of the area, and that it failed to comply with policy DM1.

201. HGY/2017/3071 65 & 67 NORTH ROAD N6 4BQ

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a part single, part three storey building to provide 8 self-contained flats (Amended Plans).

The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- a. In response to a request for clarification on what less than substantial harm meant, the Committee was advised that substantial harm and less than substantial harm were categories set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. In the context of this application, less than substantial harm was characterised as having a minor adverse impact on the conservation area.
- b. Officers advised that fire brigade access was a building control issue. However, officers were satisfied that a fire truck could access the site in the eventuality that all of the parking bays were in use. Officers also confirmed that they were happy with the location of the disabled parking bay.
- c. In response to a question about location of a fire hydrant, officers advised that, again, this was an issue relevant to building regulations rather than planning permission. Officers also advised that the Fire Brigade usually request that a fire hydrant be no more than 45 metres from the furthest reach of a building, however this could be mitigated by the inclusion of sprinkler system, for example.
- d. In reference to a request for clarification, officers acknowledged that the distance to the existing fire hydrant was 100 metres. In order to meet building regulations, that distance could be offset by either installing a closer hydrant or installing a sprinkler system.

Sir Geoffrey Bindman QC and Nathalie Lieven QC spoke in objection to the application.

The Committee was informed that the objectors were concerned about the impact of a developer squeezing 8 luxury flats into a fairly confined space and suggested that such an application was not in the public interest. Furthermore, this application was opposed by local residents and the neighbouring school. It was also suggested that the original planning permission granted for demolition and subsequent rebuilding of two houses on the site was a 'stalking horse', intended to make it easier to secure subsequent planning permission for 8 flats.

The footprint of the original site was considerably smaller than the subsequent proposal and the application would have a much greater impact on the site. It was felt, therefore, that there was a significant difference between the two proposals. The objectors felt that that the building was not a high quality design and did not add any aesthetic quality to the local area. The objectors also informed the Committee that, as 8 luxury flats, the application would not increase housing stock where it was needed i.e. genuinely affordable homes. The objectors emphasised that this was sensitive site, being a Grade 1 listed site within a conservation area and next to a primary school. The Committee were urged to reject this application.

Cllr Morris also spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Morris raised five principle objections to the proposals, namely; overdevelopment of the site, loss of garden, lack of amenity, safety of residents on the site and parking. The Committee was informed that the new proposals significantly increased the footprint and bulk of the site, compared to the previous proposal.

The Committee put questions to the objectors:

- a. In response to a request for figures in relation to the increased footprint, Cllr Morris advised that the previous proposals were 365.6 metres squared and the new building was 423 meters squared.
- b. In response to a question, the objections of the school were summarised as loss of privacy from the development, as it was overlooking the school, and proximity to the school. Officers advised that one of the conditions for granting planning permission was the use of obscured glazing.
- c. In response to a question around the scheme density, the objectors acknowledged that the building met all of the relevant density requirements and also acknowledged the need to meet ambitious housing targets. However, the objectors suggested this proposal was not in a suitable location and neither was it appropriate to the local amenity. Objectors also raised concerns about the impact of obscure glazing on the car parking space.

Stuart Minty, Tom Slater, Brian Springer and Andy Ward, spoke in support of the application. The applicant's representatives outlined that the site already had planning permission for demolition and replacement of two large dwelling houses and all of the re-commencement conditions had been discharged. The site was close to local amenities and was well within building density targets. The Committee was advised that the site also met all of the targets set out in the London Plan around small sites. The proposal equated to a net addition of six non-affordable units. The Committee was urged to grant planning permission.

The applicants responded to questions from the Committee:

- a. In response to a question, the Committee was advised that an additional 6 units was below the level at which affordable housing provision was required as part of any development, as per Haringey planning policies.
- b. In response to a question, the applicant acknowledged that if the Fire Brigade required the installation of a sprinkler system they would be happy to provide this. Officers clarified that this would be covered as part of the building regulations and therefore the Committee could not condition this. However, the Committee could include provision of a sprinkler system as an informative if they were minded to grant planning permission.
- c. In response to a request for clarification, officers advised that they were not aware of any requirements in relation to the proximity of front doors to vehicular access/parking.

The Chair MOVED that the application be GRANTED, subject to the inclusion of an informative around installation of sprinkler system, and following a vote, with 8 in favour, 3 against and no abstentions or refusals, it was

RESOLVED

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or Assistant Director of Planning is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives:

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 approved plans comprise drawing nos: 254_EE_01 Rev P2, 254_EE_02 Rev P2, 254_EX_01 Rev P2, 254_GA_03 Rev P3, 254_S_01 Rev P2, 254_S_02 Rev P2, 15246/A2_AIA_Rev.B, 254_GE_01 Rev P4, 254_GE_02 Rev P5, 254_GA_01 Rev P6, 254_GA_02 Rev P6, 254_GA_03 Rev P3, 254_GS_01 Rev P3, 254_GA_00 Rev P12, SK02 Rev 01, TR16 Rev P1 & Tree Survey Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Method Statement, T&PPB6533R001F0.2 Rev 0.1 dated 05 December 2017, PB6533 TR15a, PB6533 TR15b, PB6533 TR15c, Energy Strategy dated July 2017, Heritage statement AH355/1 dated December 2015, Car Park Beat Survey Review dated 22nd January 2018, Schedule of Traffic Movement dated 11/04/2018 & Construction Management Plan Rev B dated 15th January 2018. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans except where conditions attached to this planning permission indicate otherwise or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for a non-material amendment.

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 description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the external materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to 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 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017

4. Notwithstanding the submitted details, further details of a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any superstructure works commencing on site. The scheme shall include the following details:

- a) replacement tree planting their location, species and size;
- b) soft plantings;
- c) hard landscaping: including ground surfaces, kerbs, edges;
- d) any other landscaping features forming part of the scheme;
- e) green roofs.

All landscaping in accordance with the approved scheme shall be completed/planted during the first planting season following practical completion of the building hereby approved. The landscaping and tree planting shall have a two year maintenance/watering provision following planting and any trees or shrubs which die within five years of completion of the development shall be replaced with the same species or with an alternative agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

5. Notwithstanding the approved plans details of the design of the refuse and recycling bins enclosure and cycle storage enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

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 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

6. No lights, meter boxes, flues, vents or pipes, telecommunications equipment, alarm boxes, television aerials or satellite dishes shall be fixed or installed to the external faces of the building other than as shown in the plans hereby approved without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

7. Before the first occupation of the building hereby permitted the window openings on the southern elevation at first and second floor level shall only be glazed or re-glazed with obscure glazing and any opening part of the windows shall be at least 1.7m above the floor of the rooms in question.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

8. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all 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 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 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

9. No development shall take place until details of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In specific, the plans shall include details/ measures to address the following:
- a) a programme of works with specific information on the timing of deliveries to the site to minimise disruption to traffic and pedestrians on North Road, in specific including St Michaels's School, as well as users of the nearby garages on North Road,
 - b) details of any vehicle holding area;
 - c) details of the vehicle call up procedure;
 - d) location of temporary hoarding, storage buildings, compounds, construction material and plant storage areas used during construction;
 - e) details of wheel washing and measures to prevent mud and dust on the highway during demolition and construction.

Thereafter, the approved plans shall be fully implemented and adhered to during the construction phase of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the construction of the development does not unduly impact on the amenities of the existing occupiers of the properties on the site.

10. No development shall take place until such time as the lead contractor, or the site, is signed to the national Considerate Constructors Scheme and its published Code of Considerate Practice, and the details of (i) the membership, (ii) contact details, (iii) working hours as stipulated under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, and (iv) Certificate of Compliance, are clearly displayed on the site so that they can be easily read by passing members of the public, and shall thereafter be maintained on display throughout the duration of the works forming the subject of this permission.

Reason: To ensure that the construction of the development does not unduly impact on the amenities of the existing occupiers of the properties on the site.

11. All works associated with this development shall be undertaken in accordance with the detail as specified in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment. In specific the erection of fencing for the protection of retained trees shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and

surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees within the site during constructional works that are to remain after works are completed consistent with Policy 7.21 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

12. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed to the specifications of: "Part M, M4 (2), Category 2: Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings" of the Building Regulations 2013 and thereafter retained in that form.

Reason: To ensure that the development is capable of meeting 'Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings' standards.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: CIL Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £42,145.39 (948.9 sqm x £35 x 1.269) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £273,586.85 (948.9 sqm x £265 x 1.088). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be 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: 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.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Other restrictions

The grant of a permission does not relieve the applicant/developer of the necessity of complying with any local Acts, Regulations, Building By-laws, private legislation, and general statutory provisions in force in the area or modify or affect any personal or restrictive covenants, easements etc., applying to or affecting either the land to which the permission relates or any other land or the rights or any person(s) or authority(s) entitled to benefit thereof or holding an interest in the property.

202. HGY/2016/4095 ST JOHN'S CHURCH AND HALL ACACIA AVENUE N17 8LR

The Committee considered an application for remodelling and extension to an existing church. Demolition and replacement of existing hall on church site with new community facility/nursery. Proposed 22 new build residential units to church site and 10 new build residential units to Acacia Avenue site with a mix of 1, 2, 3, and 4 bedroom accommodation over 2 - 4 storeys.

The Planning Officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report and the addendum report.

Cllr Bull spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Bull welcomed redevelopment of the site as it had been largely abandoned for 20 years. The Committee was advised that residents were concerned that development of the site had involved cutting back some of the overgrown land adjacent to neighbouring properties and that they felt exposed as a result. Concerns were raised that this could result in increased crime levels in an area with an existing high level of crime.

Cllr Bull informed the Committee that his primary concern was with Site B and a perception that the site was going to be over-developed. Cllr Bull advised that local residents were also concerned that; the proposal did not blend into the local architecture, loss of light to surround properties, the roof line did not match the neighbouring properties, and the prominence of the site within the local area.

Roger Molineux, the architect for the site spoke in support of the application. The site was being developed on behalf of Christian Action Housing. The Committee were informed that in relation to Site B, the distances to other buildings and depth of gardens had been discussed with officers at the design development stage and was entirely compliant with regulations. Mr Molineux commented that the church had worked closely with officers throughout the process.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- a. In response to a question around the recommendations of the quality Review Panel, officers advised that the surrounding gardens had been reinstated to 1 metre wide and the front of the development had been set back.
- b. Officers also advised that in regards to the parapet detailing, this had been raised in order to simplify the design by reducing the number of steps on the side profile to two.
- c. In response to a question, officers advised that given the 24m distance to neighbouring property and given the site's orientation relevant to those houses and the sun, the loss of privacy and loss of light to surrounding houses was not considered to be significant.
- d. In response to concerns about the busy road and a neighbouring nursery, officers advised that as the 40 MPH limit was a pre-existing situation, there was not much that could be done through the planning permission. The Head of Development Management agreed to write the relevant person in TfL and raise concerns about the suitability of the local speed limit. **(Action: Dean Hermitage).**

The Chair MOVED that the application be GRANTED and following a vote, with 11 in favour, zero against and no abstentions or refusals, it was

RESOLVED that

That Members delegate authority to the Head of Development Management or Assistant Director for Planning to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to a S106 Legal Agreement and the expiry of the publicity period.

203. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The Committee noted the update on major proposals.

204. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Committee noted the applications determined under delegated powers.

205. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

N/A

206. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting date was noted as 9th July.

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair

Date