

MINUTES OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE

23 January 2006

Councillors:

*Davidson (Chair), *Bevan (Vice Chair), Adamou, *Basu, *Dodds, *Peacock, *Rice, *Santry, *Engert, *Hare, *Newton

*Members present

PASC88 APOLOGIES (Agenda item 1)

Apologies were received from Cllr Adamou.

PASC89 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS (Agenda Item 2)

The Chair had agreed to take a late item of urgent business in respect of Saltram Close Estate.

Members were advised that the reason for the urgency for the report on Saltram Close Housing Estate was to try to achieve the draw down of grant by Servite from the Housing Corporation as there would be no roll-over. The three parts of this major Estate Regeneration Scheme are linked by the single planning scheme and these changes need to be tied up before the other elements can be progressed.

It was a virtual necessity that the disposal of part of the Housing Estate land, which would require a further report to the Executive, was on a finalised and clear-cut planning basis. The Housing Service would need to ensure that the project was delivered by the end of March 2006.

The reason for lateness was that negotiations for the sale of the Council's land had not been concluded; agreement had been reached in principle, at officer level only, on 17 January 2006. The different aspects of the scheme and the different procedures inter-related but have caused delays to each other. The Chair of PASC has agreed to take it as a late/urgent item.

Planning Applications Sub Committee approved the Saltram Close Planning Application on 12 September 2005. The approval committed the Council and its partners to undertake further consultation and dialogue with the residents of Saltram Close Housing Estate to finalise interventions on site A; this report described the outcome of resident consultation. Paragraph 6 onwards highlighted the changes to the original application in more

detail and members were asked to note this and receive a further application in due course.

Two objectors spoke; one resident felt that a properly resourced and managed Community Centre would be an asset and provide activities for young people that could potentially reduce crime and vandalism. The Vice Chair of the Residents Association spoke and advised members that 56% of the local residents did not want a community centre. Members were advised that residents felt the consultation process had been very effective. They had held 2 meetings with the Metropolitan Police and their methods of stopping and questioning youths; dispersing them where appropriate, had proved very successful.

The Housing Officer addressed concerns about the decking and explained that it's removal would be part of phased works; the timetable for which would be fixed by May. Members were advised that officers had met with Church representatives with regard to the community centre and the underpass would be removed as part of the forthcoming flat development.

RESOLVED

Members noted the changes to proposals for Site A, following resident consultation. They asked to be circulated this item before it is considered again under Delegated Powers. They also stressed the importance of ongoing consultation with Education and Housing and the service directors were asked to note this.

PASC90 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 3)

Councillor Newton advised those present that he was the Ward Councillor for 14-16 Creighton Avenue, however; he had made no public declaration of any opinion on this application so therefore this was not a personal or prejudicial interest; he simply wished to clarify the point. He also wished to correct an error in the report which said he had objected to the application, he stated that this was not the case.

Councillor Santry declared an interest in respect of item 8.8 (Coles Park Playing Fields, White Hart Lane) in that she had previously made a public representation on this item. She decided to leave the room when this application was discussed and decided on.

Councillor Hare was asked by other members if he should declare an interest in that he had previously represented Friends of the New River Action Group but he felt it was not a conflict of interest as he had not made any previous public representations on any of the items before PASC this evening.

PASC91 DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Chair of the Governors of Crowland Primary School had submitted a formal deputation to speak in support of a temporary all weather pitch in Markfield Park. It was agreed that this Deputation would be heard at the same time as the application.

PASC92 MINUTES (Agenda Item 5)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub Committees on 13 December 2005 be agreed and signed

PASC93 PERFORMANCE STATISTICS ON DEVELOPMENT CONTROL, BUILDING CONTROL AND PLANNING ENFORCEMENT (Agenda Item 6)

Members received the Planning Enforcement statistics as a tabled item. All statistics and reports were noted

The Assistant Director, Planning, Environmental Policy and Performance Enforcement made a particular reference to 93% achievement of target for major applications, 81% of minor applications and 91% of other applications

PASC94 DECISIONS UNDERTAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS
(Agenda Item 7)

Noted

PASC95 PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 8)

RESOLVED

That the decisions of the Sub Committee on the planning applications and related matters, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes, be approved or refused, with the following points noted:

1. Gladesmore School and Markfield Recreation Ground

Members agreed to receive a tabled letter from Sport England which set out two extra conditions which they asked to be added to this application. Officers advised that any objections from Sport England would trigger a referral to the Government Office for London. The original submission for the sports pitch had been amended and was now in accordance with the UDP. The size of the proposed sports pitch had been reduced to be the same as the existing pitch to be replaced, the size of the fencing had been reduced, the floodlighting removed and the consent was to be for a temporary period of 3 years. Members were asked to consider the urgency of this request, whether they considered it suitable use of Green Belt land; appropriate to the landscape and environment and whether any further delay to consider alternatives could impact on the timescale and the ODPM bid. A members' site visit to Markfield Recreation Ground had taken place that morning.

The objectors spoke and advised members that they considered this to be an inappropriate use of Green Belt land and were concerned about the impact of the use of tarmac on the drainage. Friends of the Parks Forum and the Local Wildlife Trust also made representations. Both groups felt that the emergency relocation of the school was a priority but that alternative sports

facilities should be found. They were concerned that portacabins created a gap between the ground which could attract horseplay and compromise safety. They were also concerned about noise and loss of amenity to residents if the facilities were used out of school hours. They were also concerned about the protection of 2 species of birds nesting in the park but officers advised that this was not a planning consideration.

The Ward Councillor spoke and stated that, although he sympathised with objectors concerns and agreed this was a very difficult decision to put before PASC members; the ongoing disruption to the children's' education was paramount.

The Chair of the Governors spoke and advised members of the stress which pupils, parents and teachers had been subjected to since the fire and relocation. Transporting pupils on buses lost an hour of teaching time every day and this seriously impacted on the ability to deliver the National Curriculum. The current PCT building was unsuitable, lacked an adequate playground facility and further transport was required to take the children to PE facilities. Many pupils have had to move and, as schools are funded on pupil numbers, this puts the sustainability of the school at risk. The Friends of Crowland Parents Association agreed with the Chair of Governors. Both groups paid tribute to the loyalty of the staff at Crowland but stressed that the temporary relocation, nearly a year ago, had been a huge blow to morale. Finally the majority of Tottenham residents could not afford private tutors to enable their children to catch up. The Education Officers present confirmed that Gladesmore Community School was dependant on an all weather sports pitch to deliver the National Curriculum. Finally, the Assistant Director, Planning, Environmental Policy and Performance reinforced to members that this was a single application and both parts must to be decided on in unison. She further stressed that the proposals for the building and the pitch were only suitable for temporary use.

In summing up; the Chair felt that all speakers had made valid and eloquent representations. Members agreed that this application was being submitted in exceptional circumstances and therefore should not set a precedent. Members agreed the application, subject to conditions including an amendment to condition 1, with the two extra conditions suggested by Sport England; one of which required the satisfactory restoration of the sports pitch; an extra condition that the space under the portacabin be closed in; a Methodology Statement on the pitch's

biodiversity and ecology and a condition on hours of use to be agreed.

2. 14-16 Creighton Avenue N10

Members were reminded that this item was previously heard at PASC on 28 November and had been deferred for a members site visit. Two objectors spoke who felt that Pages Hill residents would suffer the severest loss of amenity from this application. The aspect from Pages Hill had been surveyed by members during the site visit. The objectors felt that the development would cause overcrowding, the design was poor and that the area already had many similar properties. Planning Officers advised that they did not consider this a backland development (density standards in backlands are tighter). The local Ward Councillor also spoke in support of the objectors and felt that the fourth storey created a further loss of amenity from bulk, height and scale. The applicant spoke in support of his revisions to the original application and felt that he had addressed these concerns. Members decided to refuse the application on the grounds of bulk, mass, height, overbearing of rear block and loss of amenity to the occupiers of Pages Hill. Cllrs Dodds, Davidson and Rice abstained from the vote.

Cllr Bevan left the meeting after this item and returned during the item on 57 Mount Pleasant Road. Cllr Santry left after this item and returned for the item on 154 West Green Road N15.

3. Coles Park Playing Fields, White Hart Lane N17

Members agreed this application but with temporary permission for 2 years, not 1 year as stated in the application.

4. 154 West Green Road N15

Members were advised that this was a renewal of a previous permission which had not yet been implemented. Members agreed the application, subject to conditions and 106 agreement, with an extra informative about standards of materials and a condition about treatment of the Gable Ends.

5. Land at Winns Mews N15

Members had visited this site and a revised plan was tabled showing narrower units. Two objectors spoke and distributed site plans and photographs which set out their concerns about the

impact on the views from residents' gardens. A supporter of the application spoke about his concerns regarding alleged current use of the site by drug users, prostitutes and the rodent infestation. Members decided to refuse the application on the grounds of mass, bulk, the overbearing and intrusive nature of the fifth unit and loss of amenity. Conservation Area Consent also refused.

Cllrs Dodds and Basu left the meeting at this point. Cllr Bevan rejoined the meeting during the discussion of the next item and therefore did not vote on it.

6. 57 Mount Pleasant Road, N17

This application had also been the subject of a members' site visit and officers advised members that the application consisted of 4 parts. One section was the 'Certificate of Lawfulness'; usually dealt with under delegated powers, within the scope of permitted development. An objector spoke and outlined his concerns about excessive tree felling and felt that the basement was unsafe. The applicant spoke; a Social Care professional experienced in working with children with disability. Members were advised that the home (a 4 bedroom house) would accommodate 6 children and 2 supervisory staff; one on night duty. The applicant advised that the basement was currently under construction and therefore subject to further improvements. Members were also advised that the outbuilding on the site would be used for storage only. The planning officer clarified to members that the building must be contained within its boundaries or the Certificate of Lawfulness could not be granted.

Members agreed and refused the application as follows:

- Retention of dormer window – refused
- Retrospective Planning application for the erection of single storey out building in rear window (Certificate of Lawfulness) – deferred until the land issues could be examined and identified.
- Retention of basement to form storage space – agreed
- Change of use from residential to Children's home caring for a maximum of 6 children and supervising staff including the provision of a staff room/office -refused on the grounds of suitability of premises for the number of children to be cared for, parking, traffic disturbance, limited access for deliveries, and amenity of neighbours.

7 79 Creighton Avenue

Three objectors addressed the Committee, their main concerns being the potential traffic problems, lack of parking and impact on the safety on the children at nearby Fortismere School, the loss of amenity of local resident's gardens and overlooking, the excessive tree felling and the development being out of character. They had no objection to the use as a care home; although they felt that there were an adequate number of other care homes in the area. The friends of Coldfall Wood also addressed the committee to stress the ecological importance of this unique piece of woodland, which surrounded the development. The local ward councillor also spoke in support of the objectors; he felt that this was a building of special character in Muswell Hill and reminded PASC members that the application had been the subject of some 120 objections.

The applicant's representative supported the development in that she felt there was a shortage of respite care homes in the West of the Borough and that the building would be refurbished to modern care standards. She advised members that the applicant had worked extensively with a landscape architect and an arboriculturist and felt that overlooking was minimal. Furthermore; she understood that the land surrounding the development was an old garden and not the actual woodland. She advised that an appropriate rainwater/foundations survey would be carried out prior to commencement of works. Finally, a survey had been conducted of similar care homes' parking facilities and the proposed 7 spaces and 7 cycle spaces was felt to be adequate.

Members agreed the application, with 5 voting for and 3 voting against, with an enhancement to the informative/condition about trees in that the nature of the species should be specifically native; and that the Council's Nature Conservation Officer should be consulted about appropriate species. Extra Conditions to be added regarding 1) Hydrological survey to investigate any underground stream (in conjunction with Thames Water). 2) Submission of further elevational drawings showing details of feature or contrasting brickwork; 3) a Renewable Energy Sources condition.

PASC96 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

27 February 2006, 7pm

The meeting ended at 11.15 pm