

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

Councillors: Beacham, Demirci (Chair), Erskine, Mallett, Peacock (Vice-Chair), Reid, Rice, Scott and Waters

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PC86.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Basu, for whom Cllr Mallett was substituting, and from Cllr Schmitz, for whom Cllr Scott was substituting.</p>	
PC87.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>Members were advised that the report on decisions made under delegated powers between 31 October and 20 November 2011 had been omitted in error from the agenda pack, and it was requested that this item be taken as a late item of urgent business.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That this item be considered under 'new items of urgent business' at the appropriate point in the agenda.</p>	
PC88.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
PC89.	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</p> <p>There were no deputations or petitions.</p>	
PC90.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the minutes of the meeting held on 14th November 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair.</p>	
PC91.	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p> <p>The Chair varied the order of the agenda in order to take item 8, Land to Rear of 10-12 St James' Lane N10, after items 9 and 10.</p>	
PC92.	<p>LAND TO THE WEST OF TOTTENHAM HALE STATION / OFF WATERMEAD WAY, STATION ROAD, N17</p> <p>The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, that set out details of the application, planning history, consultation and responses, relevant planning policy and assessment, and</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

recommended that the application be granted subject to conditions. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining the key points of the application and responded to questions from the Committee.

The Committee asked whether the scheme took into account the likely increased numbers of passengers for Spurs, were the new stadium development to proceed, in response to which the Transportation Officer advised that this had been a consideration and that the proposed enhanced public waiting area took the potential increase in passenger numbers for Spurs into account. Concerns were raised regarding the loss of green space in the area as a result of this proposal, and an additional condition was suggested in respect of landscaping such as large planters, to address this issue. The Committee also requested that a condition be added requesting that the commemorative plaque laid by the former Mayor Mary Neuner be retained and replaced in an appropriate place at the station. In response to a question from the Committee, it was confirmed that this proposal would have no impact on any work on widening of the railway.

The Committee examined the plans of the proposal.

Marc Dorman, Assistant Director, Planning, Regeneration and Economy, advised that the applicants were willing to accept conditions in respect of the retention of the commemorative plaque and landscaping, and also conditions regarding signage and feature lighting.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was:

RESOLVED

That, with the additional conditions relating to the retention of the commemorative plaque laid by former Mayor Mary Neuner, landscaping, signage and feature lighting, application reference HGY/2011/1587 be granted, subject to conditions.

PC93.

389 WIGHTMAN ROAD, N8 0NA

The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out details of the application for planning permission at 389 Wightman Road, N8, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and assessment. The report recommended that the application be granted subject to conditions. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining key aspects of the report, and responded to questions from the Committee.

The Committee asked about the need for an equalities impact assessment in relation to the application, and it was advised that this was addressed at paragraph 7.3 of the report. In response to

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

a question regarding the external materials of the proposed extension, it was reported that these would match the existing materials. The Committee asked whether the expansion of the mosque would have any parking implications, in response to which the Transport Officer advised that an analysis of how worshippers currently reached the site had shown that very few currently travelled by car, and that a travel plan was in place to reduce this number further. It was reported that the expansion of the site would not result in an increase in numbers compared with the current busiest time, which was for Friday prayers. The only condition that had been requested in respect of parking had been for the provision of two disabled spaces.

The Committee considered the plans.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was:

RESOLVED

That application reference HGY/2011/1123 be granted, subject to conditions.

PC94.

606 LORDSHIP LANE, N22 5JH

The Committee considered a report, previously scheduled, which set out details of the application for planning permission at 606 Lordship Lane, N22, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and assessment. The report recommend that permission be granted, subject to conditions and to a s106 Legal Agreement. The Committee was advised that condition 4 in the report should be deleted, as it had been duplicated and that a new condition should be added requiring a central satellite dish. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining the key aspects of the report and responded to questions from the Committee.

The Committee expressed concern that those residents who had already moved into the previous development at the public house would now stand to lose their parking rights, as the existing proposal would result in the loss of the car park and, as a car-free development, they would not be able to apply for permits for on-street parking in the CPZ area. Officers advised that when the previous development was approved, it was on the basis that parking would be provided by the developers and would not be provided on-street. The developers were now proposing the current development which would result in the loss of the car-park, and concern was expressed at the precedent it might create to then allow on-street parking in such circumstances.

In response to further concerns raised by the Committee regarding the impact on existing tenants, Mr Dorfman advised

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

that on the basis of analysis showing that the streets in the vicinity were not subject to heavy parking pressure and that there was limited scope for further development in the area, it might be possible to enable existing residents of the existing development, which had not originally been designated car-free, to apply for or keep existing parking permits, but for the new development to be fully car-free and for the existing development to be car-free only in respect of successive occupiers, not current occupiers. Members welcomed this proposal and the Transport Officer advised that they could support such an arrangement. It was confirmed that CPZ restrictions did not apply to anybody who was entitled to a blue badge.

The Committee examined the plans.

The Chair moved the recommendations of the report, with the amendment that the car free requirement should not apply to residents of the existing development, and it was:

RESOLVED

That, with the amendment to the Section 106 agreement such that existing residents of the development would not be affected by the designation of the existing and proposed residential units as 'car free' and would therefore be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit:

- 1) That Planning Permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2011/1889, subject to a pre-condition that that Simon Oliver Magic Drinks Ltd and [the owner (s)] of the application site shall have first entered into an Agreement with the Council under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As amended) and Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 in order to secure £20,729.38 as an Educational Contribution, £1000 towards the amendment of the TMO and £1000 towards recovery costs; i.e. a total of £22,729.38.

(1.1) That the Agreements referred to in Resolution (1) above being completed within such extended time as the Council's Assistant Director (Planning Policy and Development) shall in his sole discretion allow; and

(1.2) That in the absence of the Agreements referred to in Resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for, the planning application reference number HGY/2011/1889 be refused for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide an Education

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

	<p>Contribution in accordance with the requirements set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance 12 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development' attached to the Haringey Unitary Development Plan and a contribution towards the amendment of the TMO.</p> <p>(2) That, following completion of the Agreement referred to in Resolution (1) within the time period provided for, planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2011/1889, subject to conditions.</p>	
<p>PC95.</p>	<p>LAND TO REAR OF 10 - 12 ST JAMES'S LANE, N10</p> <p>The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out details of the application for land to rear of 10 – 12 St James's Lane, N10, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses and analysis. The report recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions. The Planning Officer gave a presentation outlining key elements of the application, and responded to questions from the Committee. For the Committee's information, an appeal decision in relation to the site, dating from 2005, was circulated.</p> <p>In response to a question from the Committee regarding whether the proposal enhanced the Conservation Area, it was reported that, as this was a backlands site that would not be visible from the street and the proposed design was simple, it was felt that it would have a neutral impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Three local objectors addressed the Committee in objection to the proposal on behalf of a number of local residents in the area. Residents stated that the proposed building was excessively large for the site. There would be an impact on the privacy of local residents, as the building would overlook neighbouring gardens. The existing garages were agreed to be unsatisfactory, but at least they were not visible, whereas the bulk of the proposed building would affect the overall outlook. Residents had come together to object to the application out of concern regarding the dominance of the building, which was felt to be out of keeping with the surrounding area and would result in significant overlooking. It was further stated that the proposal would result in loss of light and the sense of open space in the area. The Committee was urged to come and view the site from the homes that would be affected in order to gauge the full impact.</p> <p>The Committee asked questions on the representations made by local residents. Local residents advised that they had some drawings illustrating the impact of the proposal, and it was agreed that these should be circulated, although the Planning Officer</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

advised that, without knowing the background to how the drawings were prepared, the Committee should use their judgement in assessing this information, in conjunction with the information provided in the technical drawings. Objectors advised that the bulk of the proposal was their primary concern; Residents were not opposed to the principle of development on the site, but were concerned regarding the scale of this proposal and the resultant overlooking.

The agent for the applicant, Mr West, addressed the Committee in support of the application. Mr West advised that the design process had begun with scrutiny of the planning history of the site, and it was felt that the current proposal addressed all of the issues which had arisen as a result of previous proposals. It was reported that the responses to the pre-application consultation process with local residents and groups had been encouraging, and that suggestions made by planning officers had been incorporated into the scheme submitted. The Committee was advised that a large number of addresses had been consulted as part of the application process, but that only a small number of objections had been made.

Mr West stated that the design reflected the pitch and proportions of surrounding roofs, and expressed confusion at the concerns raised by residents of Church Crescent, as the appeal decision in respect of the previous, larger, proposal had identified that there would be no material harm to these properties. Mr West rejected the suggestion that the proposal represented overdevelopment of the site, as the footprint of the proposed building would be a smaller percentage of the total site area, compared with those of surrounding properties. Mr West did not feel that a further site visit was required as the application had already undergone a thorough assessment process and requested that the scheme be approved.

The Committee asked questions of the applicant's agent. In response to a question regarding whether the scheme was felt to be dominant, Mr West disagreed and stated that this was a smaller proposal, subordinate to the surrounding properties. In response to concerns regarding overlooking, Mr West advised that there were no windows looking towards properties on St James' lane, and that the terrace looked inwards. It was reported that the distances between the proposed building and neighbouring gardens were within the acceptable limits as set out in planning guidance. The Committee asked about the average distance between the building and site boundary, and it was advised that this was 1.5m at the lower ground floor level, with the upper storey further set back.

In response to a question regarding arrangements for emergency services and waste disposal, Mr West advised that the 4m width of the driveway was adequate for emergency vehicles, and that in

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

	<p>addition a condition was proposed requiring sprinklers to be installed. With regards to waste disposal bins would be moved down to the end of the drive on collection days and retained inside the rest of the time.</p> <p>The Committee examined the plans.</p> <p>The Chair moved the recommendations of the report and on a vote of 8 in favour and 1 against it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That application reference HGY/2011/1550 be granted, subject to conditions.</p>	
PC96.	<p>APPEAL DECISIONS</p> <p>The Committee considered a report, previously circulated, which set out appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during October 2011, of which 3 were allowed and 3 were dismissed.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	
PC97.	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>The Committee considered a report on decisions made under delegated powers by the Head of Development Management and the Chair of the Committee between 31 October 2011 and 20 November 2011.</p> <p>The Committee asked about the increased height of the monopite (HGY/2011/1711) on page 16 of the report, and why this fell within permitted development, in response to which it was advised that permitted development guidelines were set nationally and that telecoms companies generally submitted applications which were within these national guidelines for permitted development.</p> <p>The Committee suggested that the arrangements for delegated decisions be considered by Members at the next meeting of the Regulatory Committee to discuss any issues.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	
PC98.	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>Monday, 9th January 2012 at 7pm.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2011**

	<p>The Chair wished everyone present good wishes for the festive season.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The meeting closed at 9pm.</p>	
--	-----------------------------------	--

COUNCILLOR ALI DEMIRCI

Chair