

MINUTES OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE 27 March 2006

Councillors:

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

*Members present

PASC110 APOLOGIES (Agenda item 1)

Received from Cllr Hare

PASC111 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS (Agenda Item 2)

None

PASC112 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 3)

Cllr Santry declared a prejudicial interest in respect of 315 The Roundway as she had previously made a representation on a similar application and also in respect of the application on Middlesex University as she was a member of the temporary governing body. She decided to leave the room when these items were discussed and decided on.

PASC113 DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS (Agenda Item 4)

A petition had been received from Local Residents with regard to Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road N8. This application had since been withdrawn and would not appear on tonight's agenda

PASC114 MINUTES (Agenda Item 5)

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Applications Sub Committees on 27 February 2006 be agreed and signed.

PASC115 PERFORMANCE STATISTICS ON DEVELOPMENT CONTROL, BUILDING CONTROL (Agenda Item 6)

Members noted that the statistics for major and minor applications were above the Haringey and Government targets and that a detailed report on planning enforcement policy issues and statistics would be brought to the first PASC of the new Municipal Year; provisionally 5 June 2006.

PASC116 DECISIONS UNDERTAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS between 6 FEBRUARY 2006 and 12 MARCH 2006 (Agenda Item 7)

In response to a member's question about the conversions into 1 bed units with no parking, officers advised that as these were above commercial premises the decision was within planning regulations.

PASC117 APPEAL DECISIONS during FEBRUARY 2006 (Agenda Item 8)

Officers were especially pleased that the 2 appeals being reported had been the subject of a second refusal.

PASC118 PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 9)

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:

Pembroke Works, Campsbourne Road N8

This application had been withdrawn.

314 High Road, N22 8JR

Members noted that this application had been granted conditional permission but that amended plans had been submitted. No objectors were present and the Chair commented that the amendments showed considerable improvement. Members agreed the application, subject to conditions, with the amended plans and with an extra condition for a shared satellite dish.

673 Lordship Lane, N22 5LA

Members noted that amended elevational plans had been submitted for this application. No objectors were present. Members agreed the application subject to conditions and section 106 agreement and an extra security condition for a door entry system. In answer to members questions about car parking, officers explained this was a car free development (in line with current Government Policy); that only 5 car spaces would be provided, with no CPZ permits and that a communal satellite dish was also included in the conditions.

Hornsey Treatment Works, High Street N8

Members were advised that this item had been discussed at a Development Control Forum on 15 December (the minutes of which were attached as an appendix to the report). The first scheme had been refused and members noted that the GLA were happier with the resubmission (their comments were also attached as an appendix to the report)

Three objectors spoke (2 from local residents groups and one from the Alexandra Palace Advisory Committee) and set out their concerns about potential pollution levels from increased traffic, the size and bulk of the development, the lack of a phase 2 plan, environmental impact generally, inappropriate proximity to Alexandra Palace and Park and chemical deliveries in close proximity of a residential area and local playscheme. The Alexandra Palace Advisory Committee representative tabled their objections and were also concerned that the conditions of the 1998 Pumping Station approval had not been complied with.

The local Ward Councillor and Executive Member for Children and Young People spoke and endorsed these concerns and were concerned as to the impact the development could have for many years to come.

The Chair reminded all members speaking at Planning Committee that the Council had now entered 'Purdah' (the period prior to the local elections) and therefore Committees were only meeting to fulfil statutory obligations; i.e planning and licensing applications, and members should therefore conduct themselves accordingly.

A representative from Thames Water spoke in support of the application and explained to members the Water Authority's obligations to ensure that bromate levels in drinking water were kept as low as possible as this chemical could be carcinogenic. The current treatment methods for bromate were not sustainable; a fact which had been verified by OFWAT and the Drinking Water Inspectorate. Phase 1 of the development was for a pre-treatment works and phase 2 would be to actually remove the bromate. The Water Authority had worked with planning officers and was respectful of the amenity of local residents but felt that water treatment had unique circumstances. They anticipated 1 delivery a day, with a worse case scenario of possibly 3, and all deliveries would be supervised by Thames Water staff. In response to members' queries about the feasibility of sinking the development and piping in the chemicals; the Thames Water Project Engineer said that, due to the presence of underground pipework, and because it would be unwise to put at risk the walls of the adjacent reservoir immediately to the north, it was not possible to sink the treatment plant any further, nor could they site it on another disused filter bed further away. To pipe in the chemicals would involve 4 separate pipes being laid, over a long distance, this could be unsightly and a security risk. Bringing in chemicals by tanker was the only option.

Members decided to refuse the application on the grounds of design, height, bulk and proximity to the residential and play group area, loss of amenity on the conservation area and metropolitan open land and lack of 106 agreement and with an informative that any future submission should include information on phase 2.

51 Whymark Avenue, N22 6DJ

Members noted that this premises had been in use as a hostel for 4 years and agreed to grant temporary permission until 1 April 2008, subject to conditions and 106 agreement. In answer to members questions, officers replied that permission was personal and not transferable.

315 The Roundway, N17

Members noted that this application has been refused in May 2005 and had been the subject of an Appeal. Recent photographs of the key changes and minutes of recent DC and Design Forums, where this application had been discussed, were tabled. The Chair allowed members time to consider the points in these minutes as they had not had sight of the documents before the meeting. In response to members questions about provision of family units, officers advised that in response to local pressure, developers were now rewarded on the number of rooms provided and not just on the number of units.

Two objectors spoke and outlined their concerns about the height and bulk of the development, the impact on the 3 bordering conservation areas, the vehicle access through Church Road, the lack of family housing and amenity and generally their views that the development would be bad for Tottenham. The local Ward Councillor spoke supporting the objections; however, he felt that the area was derelict and in need of regeneration.

In answer to members' questions, officers advised that English Heritage had not expressed an opinion and that traffic management had no specific concerns. CABE had stated that although they supported this proposal; they preferred the first submission.

The applicant spoke and summarised the improvements made which were shown in the photographs tabled for members; i.e. reduced number of units, a greater expanse of brickwork, reduction in the building line (giving a wider pavement), reduction of the roof pitch, improved security, boundary treatment and tree planting. Members were advised that they had held 2 public exhibitions, local meetings and posted some 2,000 leaflets consulting local residents.

In response to members' questions, the applicant advised that the development would have 2 separate bin stores (for refuse and recycling; accessible by a key fob) and a door entry system. There

was no play area but they had proposed a section 106 contribution for environmental improvements to Bruce Castle Park.

Members felt that the improvements were not sufficient and decided to refuse the application on the grounds of size, design, mass, bulk, height, loss of amenity and character in context of the nearby conservation area and not in keeping with the street scene.

Members also expressed a view that the derelict site could be better served as one large area; possibly the subject of a CPO. Officers advised members of the new CPO Act which could be considered in similar cases in the future.

278-296 High Road, N15 4AJ

This application had already received planning permission, conditional on materials which members approved. Members were also advised that the extra drawing available at the meeting was different to the one despatched with the agenda and reports.

Former Council Depot, Stoneleigh Road N17

Members approved this application, subject to conditions, but expressed some concerns about the flat roof and quality of materials. In response to members' questions, the applicant advised that the timber finish had a 50 year Guarantee (documentary evidence of this would be produced for members' inspection); the black paint finish was anti-fly posting and anti-graffiti and that they would investigate the lifespan of polycarbon and report back to a future PASC. In response to concerns about the flat roof, members were advised that this had a 1 in 64 gradient (in accordance with building regulations).

Middlesex University, White Hart lane N17

This application asked members to discharge conditions in a previously approved planning permission. In response to members concerns about contamination; a series of emails addressing these were tabled. Although, not a planning consideration; the legal representative had investigated the possibility of indemnity insurance based on a risk assessment. With regard to materials; members felt that the colour scheme should be softened from stark white to a warmer tone. Members also remained concerned about the passage of lorries; so they agreed to defer the decision on this condition, under delegated powers, to the Assistant Director following further consultation with traffic management. The trees and methodology statements were agreed.

PASC119 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS (Agenda Item 10)

RESOLVED

That the following Tree Preservation Orders be confirmed:

- Entrance to the Gas Works bordering 123 Hornsey Park Road N8 – agreed but members asked for the Arboriculturist to revisit the Silver Birches near the substation.
- 17 Christchurch Road N8
- 12-14 Southwood Lawn N6
- 26 Crescent Road N8
- 15 View Road N6
- Tile Kiln Lane N6
- 72 Palace Road N8 – members were asked to note that a damaged Beech on this site was the subject of enforcement action
- Cedar Court, Colney Hatch Lane N10
- 25 Truro Road N22
- 42 Shepherds Hill N6
- Southwood Park, Southwood Lawn Road N6
- 2-4 Broadlands Road N6
- 23A Albert Road N4
- 30 Muswell Hill N10 – members were asked to note that this TPO was for 2 Ashes, not 1

PASC120 VOTE OF THANKS

As this was the last meeting of the Planning Applications Sub Committee of the current administration and the 2005/6 Municipal Year; Members present offered a vote of thanks to the Chair and Officers for their support at PASC during the last year and administration. The Chair also paid tribute to the work of the planning committee and the team spirit in working with opposition members.

The meeting ended at 11pm

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0109
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 27/03/2006

Location: 673 Lordship Lane N22 5LA

Proposal Redevelopment of site to include demolition of existing building and erection of 1 x 5 storey building fronting Lordship Lane comprising 5 x 1 bed, 6 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed including 14 bicycles stands, 5 car parking spaces and an area for refuse and recycling to the rear. (amended description)

Recommendation LEGAL

Decision LEGAL

Drawing No.s 7209/01A 02B 03B, 04A, 05B. 06B Site Photographs and 7209/04B Received 27 March 2006.

Conditions and/or Reasons

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 and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: in particular plan no. 7209/04B received 27 March 2006.
Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.
3. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.
Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.
4. That details of all levels on the site in relation to the surrounding area be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to ensure that any works in conjunction with the permission hereby granted respects the height of adjacent properties through suitable levels on the site.
5. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
6. The structures and areas shown to house recycling facilities and refuse and waste storage on drawing 7209/01/A within the site shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

7. A scheme for the treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development including the planting of trees and/or shrubs shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In order to provide a suitable setting for the proposed development in the interests of visual amenity.
8. Details of a scheme depicting those areas to be treated by means of hard landscaping shall be submitted to, approved in writing by, and implemented in accordance with the approved details. Such a scheme to include a detailed drawing of those areas of the development to be so treated, a schedule of proposed materials and samples to be submitted for written approval on request from the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to ensure the development has satisfactory landscaped areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.
9. Details of proposed security gates to the rear access to the site from Vincent Road, and proposed security to the communal door entry systems of the building, which shall be in accord with "Secured by Design Scheme" Standwork shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to commencement of the works
Reason: In order that the Council may be satisfied that adequate security for the benefit of adjoining occupiers and residents of the new development.
10. Details of a scheme for the provision of any satellite dish or antenna to be installed in the premises hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of such equipment.
Reason: In order to prevent the accumulation of numbers of satellite antenna which would create visual clutter on the building.

INFORMATIVE

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

INFORMATIVE

You are advised that, except for the five on-site car-parking spaces which form part of the approved plans. This development shall be defined as "car free" and no residents will be entitled to apply for a residents Parking Permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The site is located in the immediate vicinity of alternative public transport routes, short walk from Wood Green Tube Station, and is also close to shops and services.

It is considered that the site is well placed for redevelopment in planning terms, being a previously used site with strong public transport links that accord with many of the development principles being espoused by central government.

It is considered that in view of the site's location, a redevelopment that incorporates residential use is wholly appropriate. The proposed residential units will provide a valuable contribution to housing provision within the Borough offering a mix of housing sizes and types.

It is considered that the proposed development is in accordance with the policies within the UDP and introduces a carefully conceived and designed scheme that provides a sympathetic development, in keeping with the surrounding area.

The position of the proposed buildings on site means surrounding occupiers will not suffer loss of amenity as a result of additional overlooking or loss of sunlight or daylight.

Section 106

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0150
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 27/03/2006

Location: 314 High RoadN22 8JR

Proposal Erection of a three storey building and conversion of existing upper floors to create 2 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 bed flats at first, second and roof levels and two shop units at ground level. Alteration to elevations.

Recommendation GTD

Decision GTD

Drawing No.s HAS/00 01, 02 03

Conditions and/or Reasons

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 and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in particular accordance with amended plans Nos HAS 01A, HAS 03A, received on 27 March 2006.
Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.
3. The roof of the proposed single storey rear extension is not to be used as a roof terrace.
Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.
4. Notwithstanding the locations for bin stores shown on the submitted drawings, details of a scheme for the recycling, storage and collection of refuse from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The
Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.
5. The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing adjoining building.
Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighboring properties and the appearance of the locality.
6. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.
Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.

7. Details of a scheme for provision of any satellite dish or antenna to be installed on the premises hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by Local Planning Authority prior to the installation of such equipment.
Reason: In order to prevent the accumulation of number of satellite dishes or antennae which would create visual clutter on the building.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2006/0239
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 27/03/2006

Location: 51 Whymark Avenue N22 6DJ

Proposal Continuation of use of premises as a hostel for the homeless.

Recommendation GTD

Decision LEGAL

Drawing No.s

Conditions

1. That this permission shall be for a limited period expiring on 30th August 2006 when the use hereby approved shall be discontinued and determined and the land reinstated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to enable the Local Planning Authority to review and assess the use following experience after a period of operation.
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. The permission hereby granted shall not ensure for the benefit of the land but shall be personal to Panicos Aristodemou only, and upon that person ceasing to use the land the use shall be discontinued.
Reason: Permission has only been granted with respect to the special personal circumstances of the applicant and would not otherwise be granted.
4. No more than 11 persons, including any resident staff, if any, but including babies under 12 months, shall occupy the premises at any one time.
Reason: In order to limit the total number of occupants in the interests of the amenity of current and future occupants in the premises and locality.
5. No noise shall, in the opinion of the Assistant Director Enforcement cause a nuisance to any occupier of property in the vicinity of the premises to which this application relates.
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighboring occupiers of their property.
6. That details of a scheme for the storage and collection and recycling of refuse from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the hostel.
Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.
7. That a named person shall be made known to adjoining residents for them to be able to contact in the event of problems arising at all times.
Reason: In order to ensure that adjoining occupiers have a point of contact to deal with any problems arising from the use of the premises as a hostel for the homeless.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The application for the continuation of use of the property as a hostel for the homeless is supported on the basis that, no objections have been received from local residents or any of the other parties consulted. The proposal complies with Policies HSG 4.1 'Hostels for the Homeless'; HSG 4.2: 'Local Needs Provision for Hostels for the Homeless' and DES 1.9 'Privacy and Amenity of Neighbours'. Accordingly, it would be appropriate to grant a one year temporary consent to further monitor the use and to re-instate the original Section 106 Legal Agreement.

Section 106

No

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2005/2060
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 27/03/2006

Location: Hornsey Treatment Works, High StreetN8

Proposal Erection of pre-treatment facility on disused filter bed comprising new main process building and chemical storage and dosing building, associated plant and equipment and provision of new access road via New River Village and new bridge adjacent to the New River (amended description)

Recommendation REF

Decision REF

Drawing No.s 9PWD-A1-02000-IN, 9PWD/A1/5022/EX, 5023/EX, 5024/EX, 5025/EX, 5026/EX, 5027/EX, Site Plan, Site Access Report Jan 06, SKT1A , PDW/A1/5076 EX REV 9 PDW/A/3075 EX REV B 05/070-013A 9PDW-A1-2001-INC, Letter Dated 9 February 2006, Letters Dated 10 13 and 20 March 2006, Applicant Supporting Statement, Photographs, Coloured Perspectives, Ecological Statement (ELMAW CONSULTING).

1. The site is located within a sensitive area designated as a Conservation Area and as Metropolitan Open Land in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan 1998 and the Revised UDP of Sept 2004 (Draft Deposit), and adjacent to the Alexandra Palace historic park. The site commands wide views from Alexandra Palace to the north-west and from the New River open space and footpath to the east. The proposed development, by reason of its height, substantial footprint and bulk, would be detrimental to the appearance of the Metropolitan Open Land and would not enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The adverse impact would be exacerbated by the design of the building which, notwithstanding amendments made in this submission, would still appear as an intrusive industrial style of construction in a very open setting. Further, the Council is not convinced that there are no suitable alternative locations for such a scheme elsewhere within Hornsey waterworks filter/beds complex. The Scheme is thus contrary to Policies OP 3.2 Metropolitan Open Land Alexandra Palace and Park, OP 3.5 Historic Parks, Gardens and Landscapes, DES 2.2 Preservation and Enhancement of Conservation Areas of the Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policies UD2 General Principles, OS1A Metropolitan Open Land , OS3 Alexandra Park and Palace and CSV1A Development in Conservation Areas of the Revised Unitary Development Plan Deposit Consultation Draft September 2004.
- 2.

3. No Section 106 agreement exist for securing funding for landscape screen planting at the boundaries with Alexandra Palace, for improvements to Penstock Path, and improvements to Campsbourne playcentre to mitigate against the adverse visual impacts of the propose of buildings. Contrary to Policy UD10 Planning obligation of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan Consultation Draft September 2004.

INFORMATIVE

You are advised that, if any further scheme is submitted to overcome the objections set out above, the Council would wish to see the details of the intended Phase Two of development on this site submitted at the same time so that the overall impact can be assessed

Extra Conditions

Re: Former Council Depot, Stoneleigh Road N17

1. That detail of manufactures guarantee for the timber finish be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the works.

Reason: In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposed development.

2. That the block paint finish should be anti fly posting and anti graffiti.

Reason: In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the property can be maintained.

3. That a details of the lifespan of the polycarbons materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development.

4. That the flat roof shall have a gradient of 1:64.

Reason: In order to ensure that the roof of the proposed development is capable of proper maintenance

315 The Roundway N17

Schedule of Reason for Refusal

1. The proposed development by reason of excessive height, bulk, massing , design and general appearance would be out of keeping with the street scene and character and appearance of the locality and would detract from the visual amenities of the Bruce Castle Conservation Area and the setting of Bruce Castle Museum which is a Grade 1 Listed Building contrary to the policies

| | |
|---------|--|
| DES 1.1 | Good Design and How Design will be Assessed |
| DES 1.2 | Assessment of Design Quality (1) Fitting new Buildings into the Surrounding |
| DES 1.3 | Assessment of Design Quality (2) Enclosure, Height and Scale |
| DES 1.4 | Assessment of Design Quality (3) Building Lines, Layout, Form, Rhythm and Massing |
| DES 2.2 | Preservation and Enhancement of Conservation Areas |
| DES 3.6 | Character and Setting of Historic Buildings of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and UD3 Quality Design, CSV1B 'Listed Buildings', SPG1A 'Design Guidance and Design Statements' and SPG2 'Conservation & Archaeology' |