

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

Councillors: \*Peacock (Chair), \*Adamou, \*Alexander, \*Bevan, \*Beacham, \*Dodds (Deputy Chair), \*Hare, \*Patel and \*Weber  
Councillor

Also

Present: Cllrs Lister and Vanier

\*Members present

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PC22.</b>	<b>APOLOGIES</b>  Apologies for lateness were received from Cllr Adamou.	
<b>PC23.</b>	<b>URGENT BUSINESS</b>  None received.	
<b>PC24.</b>	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b>  There were no declarations of interest received.	
<b>PC25.</b>	<b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b>  None received.	
<b>PC26.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>  PASC10.  The Committee was advised that the first line of paragraph five of the minute should read 'Sedum' instead of Cedar.  Cllr Adamou entered the meeting 7:05pm.  <b>RESOLVED</b>  That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 June 2007 were agreed and signed as a correct record subject to the above amendment.	
<b>PC27.</b>	<b>APPEAL DECISIONS</b>  The Committee noted the outcome of 13 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during February of which 3 (23%) were allowed and 10 (77%) were dismissed. There were a mixed variety of appeals considered for example the conversion of a hostel into a private day nursery and two social club applications had all been dismissed.	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC28.</b></p>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>Members were asked to note the decisions taken under delegated powers between 21 May 2007 and 17 June 2007. Cllr Weber noted there were three different applications for 41 Priory Gardens N6 and 77 Priory Gardens N6 and queried what action would be taken with respect to retrospective applications once decisions had been made. Officers responded by confirming that once an application was refused it was referred to enforcement to pursue.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC29.</b></p>	<p><b>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the decisions taken within set time targets by Development Control and Planning Enforcement since the 11 June 2007 Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Committee raised concern that the statistics were incorrect and that they detailed 32% appeals allowed, however, showed 56% allowed. The Committee was informed that the figure of 56% included enforcement appeals and that they were not counted with planning appeals. The Committee further raised concern that the information within the report was misleading. The officer pointed out that the performance targets were only in respect of planning.</p> <p>The Committee requested officers to prepare an explanation of the figures provided for performance statistics and distributed to all Members of the Committee.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That an explanation of the figures be provided for performance statistics and distributed to all Members of the Committee.</li> <li>2. That the report be noted.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>PC30.</b></p>	<p><b>ARTICLE 4(2) DIRECTION: PEABODY COTTAGES CONSERVATION AREA NO 21</b></p> <p>The report was presented by Ms Shifa Mustafa, Assistant Director, Planning Policy and Development who informed the Committee that Members had previously received this report in February 2007. This report however, detailed no objections had been received and to ask the Committee to confirm the unopposed Article 4 (2)</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>Direction restricting the permitted development rights of the affected properties in the Peabody Cottages Conservation Area before it expired at the end of the six months from the date on which it was made. The Direction was made by Committee approval on 26 February 2007.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the recommendation outlined in the report be agreed.</p>	
<p><b>PC31.</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b></p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>Tha the decisions of the Planning Committee on the planning application and related matters be approved or refused with the following points noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC32.</b></p>	<p><b>REFERENCE FROM PLANNING COMMITTEE (11/06/2007): 11 MARKFIELD ROAD N15</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the proposal site consisted of a vacant 2 storey public house that had been fire damaged. The site was within close proximity of both Seven Sisters and Tottenham Hale underground stations. Markfield Road was mainly fronted by industrial buildings and the rear of the site were blocks of flats.</p> <p>The proposal represented a development of a brownfield site for residential use in accordance with national planning guidance and the London Plan. The development proposed a good mix of unit sizes included 3 x 3 and 1 x 4 bed units. The scheme had a density of 475hrh, above the London Plan guidelines however, it was considered to be well designed and fitted on the site without causing undue harm. It was considered that the development would not have adverse effects on adjoining properties, nor would there be any significant loss of sunlight or daylight to adjoining properties as a result of the development. The scheme proposed 3 off street parking and 15 secure bicycle parking spaces within the site.</p> <p>The Committee questioned officers on whether a proper assessment had been carried out on sunlight and daylight and was informed one wasn't carried out. The Committee highlighted that the report stated that the development could be car free however, 3 spaces had been provided for. It was suggested that the car parking spaces be removed to increase the amenity space.</p> <p>Cllr Vanier addressed the Committee and objected to the application on the grounds of over development. Overall and within the area there were other planning applications in total would deliver 3x1 bed, 21x2 bed, 5x3 bed, and 3x4 bed social housing which amounted to over development. The Committee was asked</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>not to look at these applications in isolation but to look at the whole area to see the overall effects. The UDP urged caution in respect of new housing development in or near existing social housing provision. It was felt that the cumulative effect of a number of small developments raised concern over the lack of amenity, environmental improvement, pressure on local schools, local health service provision, traffic and parking.</p> <p>Officers were asked to clarify the position with respect to car parking, and the Committee were advised that the Scheme did not fulfil the criteria for a car free development as the site was not within a CPZ. One of the proposed spaces was for disabled parking.</p> <p>Cllr Lister entered the meeting 7:35pm.</p> <p>The Committee further questioned the provision for bicycle spaces and asked if the number could be increased by 5 spaces. The transportation officer informed that it was excessive to ask for more than 15 spaces for this development. The Committee then went on to request the following additional conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That landscaping be provided around the development.</li><li>2. That the car parking spaces be removed at the side of the development to create amenity space.</li><li>3. That the disabled car parking space be retained at the front of the development.</li></ol> <p>The Chair moved a motion to grant the application. On a vote there being 6 in favour and 2 against the vote was carried. The application was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.</p>	
<p><b>PC33.</b></p>	<p><b>HIGHGATE WOOD SCHOOL, MONTENOTTE ROAD N8</b></p> <p>The Officer explained that this application had been considered at the last meeting of the Planning Committee. The Committee was asked to reconsider the matter again as the hours the flood lights could be used had been increased from 19:00 hours to 22:00 hrs. This condition had not been consulted on with local residents therefore, the Committee should not have made that condition. The School wanted the flood lights on until 7:00pm during school times and holidays.</p> <p>The Officer presented the report again and the Committee recommended that the previously agreed informatives be included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. That the oak tree to the north east corner of the site be cut back only as much as was required.</li><li>2. That the school should consider moving the floodlight 1 metre further north to protect the trees.</li></ol>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

The Committee was asked to note that this was an opportunity for young people to train for the 2012 Olympics. That this was an excellent site, away from residential properties providing sporting facilities. It was also noted that the School could in future come back to the Committee and request the hours be extended.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application. On a vote there being 7 in favour and 2 abstentions the vote was carried.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2006/1684  
FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED  
09/07/2007

Location: Highgate Wood School, Montenotte Road N8 8RN

Proposal: Replacement of existing hard play / games area with new flood-lit all weather pitch. Development includes 6 x new 12m high flood lights, 3m high weld mesh fencing to the main pitch and 2m high palisade fencing to boundary.

Recommendation: Grant permission subject to conditions

Decision: Grant permission subject to conditions

Drawing No's: 967/PL101 - 106 incl.

Conditions:

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

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in 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 existing trees on the site shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise affected in any way (including raising and lowering soil levels under the crown spread of the trees) and no excavation shall be cut under the crown spread of the trees without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the trees in the interest of visual amenity of the area.

4. That the development hereby approved shall be used during school hours and between 1510 and 1900 Mondays to Fridays only for after

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>school activities. Reason: to protect the existing amenity of surrounding occupiers.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE:</p> <p>That the Council Arboriculturalist be consulted about the works to the tree canopy of the nearest tree on the north eastern corner of the pitch and that any cables should be run in such a way as not to damage the root systems of the nearby trees.</p> <p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL:</p> <p>The provision of the new pitches is appropriate and generally supported. The school has reduced the height of the floodlighting columns from 16 to 12 metres and undertaken to limit the hours of use until 19.00 hours only following concerns expressed by local residents. On this basis the scheme is considered acceptable and meets the requirements of the Policies PPG17 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation', CW1 'Community Wellbeing', UD3 'General Principles', OS2 'Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)', ENV7 'Air, Water and Light Pollution' and OS17 'Tree Protection', in the Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p><b>PC34.</b></p>	<p><b>REFERENCE FROM PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE (26/03/2007): REFERENCE FROM PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE (26/02/2007): GARAGES AT HAROLD ROAD &amp; NEWTON ROAD N15</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that this application had been deferred from previous Planning Committees for a site visit to be undertaken. The applicant had now appealed on the grounds of non determination by the Council. The Committee was asked to say what decision they would have made if the Committee had a further opportunity to consider the application.</p> <p>The application site comprised the former garage court on the south side of Harold Road and Newton Road. The garages were largely unused and the site was located within a residential area. The use of the site for residential purposes would contribute to the Council's strategic housing targets. The scheme provided a good mix of dwelling types and sizes. The proposed buildings were two and three storey and so were of bulk and mass appropriate to the area and would not significantly adversely affect sunlight or daylight to the rear gardens and windows of existing houses in Herbert Road.</p> <p>Included within the scheme, 5 car parking spaces were provided and was considered to be acceptable due to the location of the scheme in an area of medium to high public transport accessibility.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>Cllr Vanier addressed the Committee and objected to the application on the grounds of over development. It was felt that the cumulative effect of a number of small developments raised concern over the lack of amenity, environmental improvement, pressure on local schools, local health service provision, traffic and parking. The Committee was asked not to look at these applications in isolation but to look at whole area to see the overall effects. The UDP urged caution in respect of new housing development in or near existing social housing provision.</p> <p>Cllr Lister addressed the Committee and raised concern over the cumulative effect of small scale developments on an area. What was currently in the vicinity of the proposed site were high density 1960s developments. We would ask for our comments to be noted and have no alternative to objective to the proposed development.</p> <p>The Applicant's representative responded and stated that this application was a low density scheme than the previous one considered. The developer was making a contribution to the amenity of the area. Traffic and parking in the area was not too much of an issue however, they had provided adequate parking for this development. The design reflected houses and gardens.</p> <p>The Committee questioned the applicant on the number of units and the proposed density. The applicant responded that the application had been in process for three years as they had wanted to resolve the design issues. The number of units had been reduced to nine. The Committee raised further concern that the design lacked lustre, the street scape was poor, and whether security and lighting been considered along with fire access. The Officer advised the Committee that security could be dealt with by adding conditions. Fire access was not considered to be necessary as the development had total street frontage. The Committee requested further conditions be added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communal satellite dish to be installed.</li> <li>• Sustainability to be built into the design – solar pre-warming of the flats, permeable hard areas and external lights solar assisted.</li> <li>• Landscaping around the development</li> <li>• Tree planting on the street frontage</li> <li>• Appropriate secure cycle racks to be provided.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair moved a motion and asked the Committee to vote on this application as if it were being considered. On a vote there were 5 in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention. The vote was carried.</p>	
<p><b>PC35.</b></p>	<p><b>381-481 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD N15</b></p> <p>The Committee was informed that the application site comprised a strip of land fronting Seven Sisters Road and would form part of the Tiverton Road Housing Estate.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>The Officer presented the report and informed the Committee that the last two applications, submitted on behalf of Family Mosaic Housing Association for residential redevelopment on the site had been refused.</p> <p>The main changes to the previous proposals were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building positioned on the boundary of Tiverton Primary School had been removed.</li> <li>• Overall the number of units and the density had been reduced.</li> <li>• The roof line of the current proposal was stepped.</li> <li>• Front and back façade materials had been changed to light brick instead of dark coloured brick.</li> </ul> <p>This redevelopment would bring about the re-use of land that was currently under used. The density (207hrh) of the scheme was in line with Council policy. The scale, bulk and overall design was considered to be acceptable. The development was proposed as a car free scheme due in part to the location of the site fronting Seven Sisters Road. The proposal also included 12 secure cycle parking bays within the development. The scheme included particular features to improve energy efficiency, sustainability including solar water panels, condensing boilers, low flush toilets and water meters.</p> <p>The Committee questioned whether the eventual occupants of the four bed properties could challenge the decision that the development was car free. The officer explained that there was a CPZ in place in the area and therefore it was possible to dedicate the development as car free as traffic management was already in place. Concern was also raised around noise, construction lorries gaining access to the site as the development was on a red route and the number of cycle spaces provided was low. Officers responded that condition 13 was replicated in condition 17 and addressed the strategy to minimise access on the red route which must not be blocked. It was agreed that further conditions be added to address noise, that the cycle provision be increased from 12 to 30 spaces and that the light brick should not be yellow.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to grant the application unanimously.</p>	
<p><b>PC36.</b></p>	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT 110 BROAD LANE N15</b></p> <p>The Committee received a presentation on this proposal site on the south-eastern corner of Broad Lane and Stamford Road. The site was currently used as an open car sales yard and the area was designated an Area of Community Regeneration.</p> <p>Planning permission was refused in 2006 on the grounds that the proposal overshadowed the adjacent building, the current scheme</p>	



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

was designed to overcome that problem. The scheme was close to Seven Sisters Station, therefore considered appropriate as a car free development.

The building was designed to return round the corner and therefore presented a frontage onto Stamford Road. It was considered that the design, detailing and materials were acceptable. The scheme had a density of 625hrh, in line with the accepted range. The proposed building would meet the latest thermal insulation requirements with good natural ventilation required by Energy Efficiency policy.

The Committee requested that permeable surfaces were used and the cycle rack provided be increased. The Officer responded to this and stated that 9 racks were provided as there were 9 residential units. This was uniformly applied across the borough. The Committee further requested that future applications should address sustainable issues in all reports.

Cllr Vanier addressed the Committee and again objected to this application on the grounds of over development and to another small scale development in Broad Lane. The Committee was asked to be mindful to look at the area as a whole. There were quite a few planning application to be considered in the future and the Committee was asked to look at these as a whole rather than looking at individual developments like the one before the Committee.

Cllr Lister asked the Committee to question the cumulative effect of a number of small developments on the area as a whole. Concern was raised over the lack of amenity, environmental improvement, pressure on local schools, local health service provision, traffic and parking.

The Applicant addressed the Committee and confirmed that there were only 8 units not 9 in the scheme. He explained that with respect to amenity space the moment the local school finished the space behind the flats and the park were constantly used by people and children at all times of the day.

The Committee was concerned that the ball area near the proposed development was not maintained and questioned whether the applicant would be prepared to make or consider a contribution to the community and develop the upkeep of this area. The applicant agreed to consult the developer however, he was aware that the ball area had been repaired twice and felt that spending money on an area that would in six months be vandalised again.

The Committee requested that further conditions be included:

- Railings and secured bicycle parking to be provided.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frontages to be provided with tree planting.</li> <li>• A brick course should be considered in consultation with the design team.</li> </ul> <p>The Chair moved a motion to grant the application. On a vote there being 5 in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions. The application was granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.</p>	
<p><b>PC37.</b></p>	<p><b>PERCIVAL COURT, HIGH ROAD N17 8ER</b></p> <p>The Committee received a presentation on this application site which was located at Percival Court via a narrow lane on the west side of the High Road. It is to the rear of 807-821 High Road N17 in the North Tottenham Conservation Area. The site was rather derelict and used as a dumping ground mainly to park cars and for car repairs.</p> <p>It was considered that the siting of residential on this part of the site was appropriate because part of the building had previously been residential. The scheme would also provide a three storey office block at the far end of the site adjoining industrial buildings. The proposed residential buildings would enhance the conservation area, as currently the existing building had no architectural merit.</p> <p>The proposal included the provision of four car parking spaces, which was considered to be reasonable provision, access was narrow, but had been adequate in the past for a car repair garage. The applicant had agreed to provide a fire hydrant on the site.</p> <p>The Committee commented that architectural merit was an understatement as it was derelict. The Committee requested further conditions for secured cycle parking and access for refuse and lighting be provided.</p> <p>The Officer further informed the Committee that the Authority had received a representation from English Heritage Archaeological Section who had requested a further condition for a process of archaeological survey. The Committee queried where Archaeological digs were reported back to. The Officer responded by advising the Committee that feedback is reported to English Heritage however, quite often nothing was found.</p> <p>The Chair moved a motion to vote on granting the application. On a vote there were 8 in favour and 1 against the vote was carried.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2007/0850 FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 09/07/2007</p> <p>Location: Percival Court, High Road N17 8ER</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey office block and 3 x 2 storey two bed houses.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions

Decision: Grant subject to conditions

Drawing No's: ABD/597/12A, 13A & 14B.

Conditions:

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

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details of the 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 retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. That details of all levels on the site in relation to the surrounding area be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

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.

7. 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.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of any of the dwellings hereby approved in the form of development falling within Classes A to H shall be carried out without the submission of a particular planning application to the Local Planning Authority for its determination.

Reason: To avoid overdevelopment of the site.

9. No development shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The site is located in an Archaeological Priority Area, and the work is required in order that the Council may be satisfied that this development does not result in the loss of features of archaeological importance.

10. Detailed plans showing:

- (a) The provision of entrance gates,
- (b) Lighting to the access road serving the site,
- (c) The design of the refuse storage area, and
- (d) The siting of a fire hydrant; shall be submitted to and approved

by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In order that the Council may be satisfied as to the detailed arrangements and layout in the access road to the site, given that this access road is of a restricted width.

INFORMATIVE: The proposed cycle storage as detailed on Plan No. ABD/597/14B should provide 6 cycle racks therein; and there shall be secure cycle racks

INFORMATIVE: Further to Condition 4 above, you are advised that the landscaping scheme submitted should be of high quality and include the planting of trees as well as shrubs.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL:**

The proposed scheme is considered acceptable for the following reasons:

The residential aspect which comprises of 3 x 2 storey two bed houses is appropriate at this part of the site due to the surrounding environment

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>which would be well suited for residential use, also part of the existing building was previously used as residential. The overall bulk and scale of the proposed mews houses would enhance the conservation area and it would not undermine the adjoining residential buildings. The overall internal layout is satisfactory and the small garden spaces provided at the rear is sufficient.</p> <p>The commercial aspect which comprises of a three storey office block at this part of the site is appropriate because it adjoins further commercial buildings and abuts the Designated Employment Area. The overall design would blend in with the proposed houses and the height would be lower than the adjacent commercial buildings.</p> <p>The proposal would not have an adverse affect on neighbouring properties neither would it affect the future occupants of the proposed mews houses.</p> <p>Lastly transportation have no objection to the scheme providing four car parking spaces.</p> <p>As such the proposal would be in accordance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG 2 'Change of Use to Residential', M10 'Parking for Development', EMP 5 'Promoting Employment Use' and the Councils SPG 1a 'Design Guidance and Design Statements', SPG 3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes', of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p><b>PC38.</b></p>	<p><b>PERCIVAL COURT, HIGH ROAD N17 8ER ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey office block and 3 x 2 storey two bed houses. The Committee agreed to grant Conservation Area Consent as planning permission for the application outlined in PC37 above was granted.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2007/0851 FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUB COMMITTEE DATED 09/07/2007</p> <p>Location: Percival Court, High Road N17 8ER</p> <p>Proposal: Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey office block and 3 x 2 storey two bed houses.</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant subject to condition</p> <p>Decision: Grant subject to condition</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

	<p>Drawing No's: ABD/597/12A, 13A &amp; 14B.</p> <p>Condition:</p> <p>1. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works for redevelopment of the site under planning permission reference HGY/2007/0850 has been made and planning permission granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides.</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect the appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<b>PC39.</b>	<p><b>SITE ADJACENT 1 MOUNT PLEASANT VILLAS N4 4HH</b></p> <p>The Committee expressed concern that they had not had an opportunity to view the site for this application and felt it prudent to request a site visit.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the decision on this application was deferred for a site visit.</p>	
<b>PC40.</b>	<p><b>SITE ADJACENT 1 MOUNT PLEASANT VILLAS N4 4HH ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of existing garages and erection of 9 x 3 storey houses (7 x 3 bed, 7 x 2 bed) and provision of 9 car parking spaces, cycle storage and associated works. The Committee agreed to defer the decision to grant Conservation Area Consent as planning permission for the application outlined in PC39 was deferred for a site visit.</p>	
<b>PC41.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business submitted.</p>	
<b>PC42.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 3 September 2007.</p> <p>The meeting ended at 10:00pm.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 9 JULY 2007**

---

Chair