

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

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

Also Present: Councillors Aitken, Diakides, Haley, Reith and Winskill

\* Members present

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>	<b>ACTION BY</b>
<b>PC121.</b>	<p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Alexander for whom Cllr Demirci was substituting and for lateness from Cllr Dodds.</p>	
<b>PC122.</b>	<p><b>URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no items of urgent business received.</p>	
<b>PC123.</b>	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</b></p> <p>Cllr Beacham declared a personal but not prejudicial interest on agenda item 12, Adoption of Conservation Area Character Appraisals as his home lay within the Wood Green Conservation Area.</p>	
<b>PC124.</b>	<p><b>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</b></p> <p>None received.</p>	
<b>PC125.</b>	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p><b>MATTERS ARISING</b></p> <p>PC107</p> <p>Members raised concern that the tabled note in response to the Tottenham Hale Residents Against Schscrapper Housing (THRASH) letter referred to during discussions at the 4 December 2007 Committee meeting did not address the original decision of the Committee. The Committee enquired about the number of applications for the GLS site which would be decided under delegated decisions. It was felt that residents and the community should have an opportunity to discuss and comment on the design features of future applications. In response the Officer advised the Committee that a further three applications were to be considered and how this would be decided was in careful discussions with the Chair of the Planning Committee, Assistant Director and/or the Head of Development Control.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 7 January 2008 be agreed and signed.</p>	
<p><b>PC126.</b></p>	<p><b>APPEAL DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Committee noted the outcome of 10 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during December 2007, of which 8 were planning applications and 2 on enforcement appeals. The outcome of the appeal decision was 3 (30%) were allowed and 7 (70%) were dismissed. These appeals were a mixture of domestic applications, one was for a signage hoarding at the bottom of Muswell Hill. The Officer advised of a correction at the bottom of page 26 of the agenda under the title 'issues' the address should read 128 Waldergrave Road.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC127.</b></p>	<p><b>DELEGATED DECISIONS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the decisions made under delegated powers by the Heads of Development Control (North &amp; South) and the Chair of the Planning Committee determined between 10 December 2007 and 13 January 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC128.</b></p>	<p><b>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the performance statistics on Development Control and Planning Enforcement Work since the 7 January 2008 Planning Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Officer gave a brief explanation of the figures within the tables included in the report. The Committee enquired of officers what was the procedure once notices had been served on premise owners. In response the Officer explained that the enforcement process was a long one, notices were served as a warning and owners could appeal. Once at appeal there was a further period of compliance then the offence became illegal and the Council could take further action.</p> <p>Cllr Dodds entered the meeting at 7:15pm</p> <p>The enforcement officer in attendance advised the Committee</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p>that a temporary stop notice had been served on 1 Grand Parade which lasted for 28 days, the owner had to cease activities for use as a social club. If the owner continued the activities then the Council could prosecute.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC129.</b></p>	<p><b>PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PROJECT UPDATE</b></p> <p>The Enforcement Officer outlined the background to the report and informed the Committee that the project was a result of a proposal to the Planning Committee to reduce and manage the open planning enforcement cases.</p> <p>The Officer updated the Committee on the current progress of the project. In phase 1 of the project 475 cases were deemed to fall within the four year rule, any case where work was carried out over four years ago is immune from legal action and closed. Phase 2 incorporated cases received from 2004 – 2006. Phase 3 dealt with the remaining cases coming in to the project on a daily basis. Since January 2007 876 cases had been received and 533 closed. Overall the number of cases closed was 1319 with 1002 remaining open. The department continued to review how effectively cases were managed and closed.</p> <p>Cllr Diakides entered the meeting at 7:20pm.</p> <p>The Committee questioned the officer on how a case was closed and in response was advised that the case depended upon a number of factors; it could well be that there was no breach or that it was not expedient to pursue the matter. The Committee further enquired what process was followed after the enforcement procedure was concluded and in response were advised that it was then difficult for the Council to get landlords to change the property back however, examples of successful enforcement cases were published in order to deter people from making similar mistakes.</p> <p>The Committee acknowledged the work of the enforcement service to date and hoped that funding would be made available to continue this project beyond April 2008.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the progress of the planning enforcement project be noted.</p>	
<p><b>PC130.</b></p>	<p><b>ADOPTION OF LOCAL INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS</b></p> <p>The Officer presented his report and advised that an initial report</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p>had been presented to a previous Planning Committee and that this report built on that following the consultation exercise.</p> <p>A five week consultation period concluded on 23 January and resulted in a number of responses received from Committee Members, statutory consultees and members of the public. The Local Information Requirements (LIRs) had been amended to take account of the comments received.</p> <p>The LIRs with the new standard application forms would go live at the end of February 2008, the mandatory timescale for implementation was the 6 April 2008.</p> <p>The Committee suggested that site waste management plans should be included in the LIRs as it was difficult for Waste management to collect refuse. In respect of environmental impact assessments the Committee felt these should have been included within the LIRs by the Government and the cumulative effects taken into consideration. In response the Officer stated that small applications (extensions) could be overly burdensome to submit a site management plan however, it was possible to request further additional information if it was pertinent to the application. In relation to impact assessments the Officer explained that in respect of very small developments it was usual to condition that sort of arrangement though it could be considered in the future as part of a broader planning process.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the recommendations as outlined in the report be agreed and adopted.</p>	
<p><b>PC131.</b></p>	<p><b>PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE SERVICES</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the proposals to introduce a more structured approach to deal with the pre-application phase of planning applications in the borough. The report detailed two different charging regimes one for basic Pre-Application Planning Advice (PAPAs) the other for Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs). The report further detailed the level of service to be provided:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New charges for developers to pay for advice.</li> <li>2. Advice would be available to agents or developers considering submitting an application of two or more units.</li> <li>3. Planning performance agreements would only be considered for major, strategic and complex applications.</li> </ol> <p>It was proposed to introduce the Pre-Application Advice Services from April 2008.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p>The Committee queried the charges for retrospective planning applications. In confirming that retrospective applications would also be charged a fee the Committee were advised that, the fees for planning applications were set by Central Government and applied across the whole country. Retrospective applications were not necessarily penalised. The majority of retrospective cases were householder applications. Additional charges for further meetings had been benchmarked and were dependent upon the level of officer who attended.</p> <p>The Committee commented that they would have liked to see the model charter included in the pilot PPAs. The officer informed the Committee that they were working with Atlas to develop a charter specific to Haringey. Atlas were encouraging authorities to individualise these charters and this was being reviewed.</p> <p>The officer further advised the Committee that the Planning Service would ask the developer to enter into an agreement to formalise the planning advice provided. Meetings with developers and planning advice provided would remain confidential until an application had been submitted. The officer providing that advice may or may not be the same officer who presented the application to the Committee.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the recommendations outlined in the report be agreed.</p>	
<p><b>PC132.</b></p>	<p><b>ADOPTION OF CONSERVATION AREA CHARACTER APPRAISALS</b></p> <p>The Committee was reminded that a report was presented to the Planning Committee on 28 September 2006, seeking approval to commence a programme of producing Conservation Area Character Appraisals (CACA) for the Borough's conservation areas for the purpose of public and stakeholder consultation, with a view to future adoption. Following approval of the programme the Committee further adopted character appraisals for nine conservation areas in Tottenham.</p> <p>The second phase of the ongoing programme of public consultations on CACA involved the following 3 conservation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CA4 Muswell Hill Conservation Area</li> <li>• CA10 Wood Green Conservation Area</li> <li>• CA12 Trinity Gardens Conservation Area</li> </ul> <p>The consultation period ran for 10 weeks and closed on 10 September 2007. A number of boundary changes had been put forward.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p>Cllr Winskill entered the meeting at 7:55pm.</p> <p>Representations received as a result of the public consultation had been considered and the CACA had been amended where appropriate. The appraisals were in the format prescribed by English Heritage. It was intended that each adopted appraisal would form part of the planning procedure, appeals procedure, enforcement and general planning decision making process.</p> <p>The Committee noted a number of infringements had been picked up during the consultation process and it was asked whether these had been referred to enforcement. In response the Committee were advised that all representations received through the consultation process were being reviewed in detail and where appropriate referred to enforcement.</p> <p>It was also intended to present to the Committee a small Article 4 appraisal, as Haringey's locally listed buildings had not been updated since 1997. Once all the CACA had been completed they would form part of the SPG.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <p>That the Character Appraisals for the above Conservation Areas be approved and adopted.</p>	
<p><b>PC133.</b></p>	<p><b>RODEN COURT, 113-115 HORNSEY LANE N6</b></p> <p>The Officer presented the report and informed the Committee that the subject site was known as Roden Court, located on the northern side of Hornsey Lane. The existing site consisted of 98 studio flats and was occupied by approximately 50 residents.</p> <p>This application followed on from a recent refusal which was for 40 extra care units and 99 residential units. The proposed development would have a density of 375hrh which was considered to be acceptable within this urban area where flats were the predominant housing type. The proposal would include together with the proposed extra care accommodation a mix of affordable family housing units, 65 habitable rooms were to be affordable and 17 habitable rooms provided within the family social rent units.</p> <p>Cllr Haley entered the meeting at 8:10pm.</p> <p>The proposed development would consist of two towers to the front of the site with projecting wings to the rear which reduced in height. It was considered that the proposal would not adversely affect the streetscape, skyline/panoramas and character of the area. It was also considered that the overall quality of the towers</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

design was acceptable and met Policy requirements. The proposal included 45 basement car parking spaces plus 3 surface car parking spaces for the extra care facility. A further 45 cycle racks had been proposed for the site, 6 to be located near the entrance to the extra care facility. A number of trees were specified for removal to facilitate the new building.

The Committee were informed that the Fire Officer had originally raised concerns regarding the access for emergency vehicles however, these had now been resolved.

The Committee requested an outline of the differences between the original application refused on the grounds of bulk, height and mass in contrast to the application now before the Committee. In response the officer explained that there had been a slight slimming down of the block, changes to the design of the front blocks, better design of the windows, a reduction in the height of the eastern side and on the right hand block a floor had been taken off the top to reduce the effect on Hilltop House and to overcome overlooking and a number of other adjustments.

Cllr Aitken addressed the Committee and reiterated what the officer had said in terms of the mix of affordable housing and stated that this proposal was a commercial residential care development. The changes made to the plans were cosmetic and did not meet the fundamental home care standards and requested the Committee to reject the application.

Cllr Haley objected to the application on the grounds of environmental sustainability. He stated the application site was close to the W5 bus route, 10 buses passed per hour on a two way connection to Archway Station. Cllr Haley further stated that the officer had alluded to looking at sustainable energy however, he felt that some form of combined heating and power system should be proposed as concerns were raised during discussions regarding the water table and the stream running through the site.

The Transport Officer explained to the Committee that whilst there was already a level of transport the site was sustainable. Haringey's policy was to encourage local residents to use public transport services. The development would not cause environmental problems.

The planning officer explained that the applicant would have to submit a statement demonstrating consistency with the Energy Assessment along with details of the ground heat pump system to be submerged. This was all covered in condition 20 in the report.

A representative of Hilltop Residents Association objected to the proposed application as Hornsey Lane served both Haringey and Islington and was on the ancient right of way which would be

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

diminished because of the development. The representative requested the Committee to accept a petition signed by 200 Hornsey Lane residents objecting to the proposed application.

Cllr Reith entered the meeting at 8:50pm.

Members questioned the objector regarding the number of storeys Hilltop House had and the distance between the Hilltop House and the boundary. In response the Committee was advised there were eleven levels.

A local resident of Roden Court addressed the Committee in support of the application. All the current flats were affected by damp, were very small, the plumbing was disintegrating, they were expensive to heat and could not be refurbished. The tenants currently living in Roden Court were key workers, nurses and people on low incomes who had lived there for the past 10 years. The proposed development would provide warm and modern flats. The majority of the trees would be retained and the development fitted in with the neighbouring blocks. The majority of the tenants wanted this application approved.

The applicant responded to concerns raised and stated that the density was below the Haringey maximum levels. The parking requirements were tailored to meet Haringey's requirements and not Islington's. The majority of the trees on the site would be retained and any removals were supported by Haringey's Tree Officer. The application was a unique mix of provision as a number of the tenants currently lived in studio apartments. It was proposed that these tenants would be moved into one bed flats. The scheme had been slimmed down to introduce better hard quality materials and daylight issues were much reduced. The applicants had met with the residents and the approach was to reinforce the ecological value of the whole of Hornsey Lane. There would be no overlooking as windows were designed to look away from Hilltop House.

The Committee questioned the applicant on the nomination rights for the social rented and extra care units and was advised that this would be 100%. The extra care provision would be located on the rear western part of the site with two lifts for access and the ground floor had communal facilities. All the one bed flats would have a balcony with shared use of a rear garden. The family flats would have private gardens.

The Committee further questioned the applicant on water issues, grey water harvesting and whether storage was available to release into the main water system. The Committee also enquired of recycling facilities particularly in relation to the care units and what system would be in place. In response the applicant stated they would be happy to work with the Council to



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

devise a plan for grey water harvesting and that space had been allocated for refuse and recycling bins separated on the site. The Officer stated that details of surface water and drainage works were detailed in condition 17 and this condition could be expanded to include rain water.

The Committee recommended that the use of materials should be subject to approval by officers. In response the applicant informed the Committee that the materials had been the subject of a consultation exercise however, they could provide further information on the high quality materials to be used.

The Legal Officer clarified an earlier misunderstanding regarding recommendation 3 in the report. If the development were agreed the S106 agreement would need to be agreed within 13 weeks. If the S106 was not agreed then the application would not be delegated to officers to agree.

The Chair moved a motion to grant the application. On a vote their being 6 in favour, one against and two abstentions. The application was granted.

**RESOLVED**

That the application be granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:  
HGY/2007/2509  
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 11/02/2008

Location: Roden Court,113-115 Hornsey LaneN6 5NL

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of one eight-storey and one ten-storey block fronting onto Hornsey Lane, with one 1 to 5 storey projecting block (western block) and one 4 to 7 storey projecting block (eastern block) at the rear; comprising 71 x 1 bed, 18 x 2 bed, 6 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed units, plus 40 extra care units (a total of 136 units) with basement car parking, cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Recommendation: GRANT – subject to conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement

Decision: GRANT – subject to conditions and Section 106 Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: PL3.01 - PL3.19 incl.

Conditions:

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

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. These should include details of external treatment to the existing rendered walls on the north-western elevation.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.

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 sit

5. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the front of the application site with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the completion of the development; such landscaping shall be implemented within 6 months of the completion of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory setting for the proposed development and in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

6. 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

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

areas in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

7. Before the development hereby permitted is occupied the parking spaces shown on Plan No PL3.03 shall be provided and shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of vehicles in connection with this approved residential development.

Reason: To ensure that parking is provided in accordance with the Council's standards, in the interests of pedestrian and highway safety, the free flow of traffic and in order to protect the amenities of the area.

8. A pre-commencement site meeting must take place with the Architect, the consulting Arboriculturist, the Local Authority Arboriculturist, the Planning Officer to confirm tree protective measures to be implemented. All protective measures must be installed prior to the commencement of works on site and remain until works are complete.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

9. The species, size and siting of the replacement trees shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the trees shall be planted within 6 months (or as otherwise agreed in writing) of the commencement of the approved treatment (either wholly or in part). The replacement trees shall be maintained and/or replaced as necessary until they are established in growth.

Reason: To maintain the visual amenities of the area.

11. An Arboricultural Method Statement, including a tree protection plan, shall be prepared in accordance with BS.5837:2005 'Trees in relation to Construction' and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason: To safeguard the health of existing trees which represent an important amenity feature.

12. Details including the type, specification and location of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the residential units are occupied and thereafter carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent adverse light pollution to neighbouring properties and Parkland Walk.

13. Notwithstanding the Provisions of Article 4 (1) and part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no satellite antenna shall be erected or installed on any building hereby approved. The proposed development shall have a central dish or aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for the residential units created: details of such a scheme shall be submitted

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property, and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to prevent the proliferation of satellite dishes on the development

14. The 'extra care' residential accommodation hereby approved shall be for the provision of extra care accommodation only for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).

Reason: To ensure the provision of an extra care facility and to enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain strict control over the nature of the use.

15. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a construction method statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. The statement shall include:

- (i) Sequence of construction activity throughout each phase;
- (ii) Location and specification of acoustic barriers;
- (iii) Details showing how all vehicles associated with the construction of the development hereby approved are properly washed and cleaned to prevent the passage of mud and dirt onto the adjoining highway;
- (iv) Details of construction lighting and parking;
- (v) The methods to be used and the measures to be undertaken to control the emission of dust, noise and vibration arising from construction works;
- (vi) Details of boundary hoardings and measures to ensure they are maintained in a secure and tidy condition.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not give rise to unacceptable impacts, upon neighbouring residential amenity and does not have an adverse impact upon Parkland Walk: a Local Nature Reserve.

16. 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 1300 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.

17. No development hereby approved shall commence until details of underground and surface water drainage works, and details of proposed storage and recycling of grey water, have been submitted to and

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure water discharge from the site shall not be prejudicial the amenities of the area, and to ensure that in the interests of water conservation there is provision for the recycling of grey water.

18. No development hereby permitted shall commence until a Demolition Method Statement has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include a methodology for demolition, mitigation for impacts arising from demolition (including dust and noise) and the named contractor(s). Thereafter, all demolition shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved statement unless otherwise agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to minimise the impact of the works on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

19. No development shall take place until a survey for the presence of bats on site has been carried out and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should the presence of bats be found, then no development shall take place until full details of measures for bat migration and conservation have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the presence and population of a protected species in line with UK and European Law.

20. A supporting statement shall be submitted demonstrating consistency with the submitted Energy Assessment, along with details of the ground heat pump system and bore holes to be submerged, and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with any written approval given by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development incorporates energy efficiency measures including on-site renewable energy generation, in order to contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions generated by the development in line with national and local policy guidance.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require naming / 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: Thames Water requests that the Applicant should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow at a later date, on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to ground level during storm conditions.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contact on 0845 850 2777.

Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

**INFORMATIVE:**

Further to Condition 3 above, regarding external materials, you are requested to;

- a, consider alterations to the areas rendering and timber cladding at the rear of the site
- b, submit details of the proposed "green roof" above the rear wings to both blocks
- c, submit details of obscure glazed windows and panels in the east elevation of the block proposed to face the boundary of the site with Hilltop House

**INFORMATIVE:**

Further to conditions 5 and 9 above, the landscaping scheme should allow for succession planting to replace trees which may die during the course of construction.

**REASON FOR APPROVAL**

The scheme has been designed sensitively to the sites sloping topography, its relationship with neighbouring properties and in particular to achieve an acceptable relationship with the adjoining Metropolitan Open Land/ Ecological Corridor to the back of the site. The architectural quality of the proposed buildings including their scale, form, massing, proportion and silhouette, facing materials and relationship to other structures is now considered acceptable. The proposal will deliver a significant amount of high-quality affordable housing and will make a positive contribution to the Borough's housing supply. The proposal will not give rise to significant overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers or adversely affect local residential amenities.

As such the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies G2 'Development and Urban Design', UD3 'General Principles', UD4

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	<p>'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage', UD9 'Location for Tall Buildings', ENV9 'Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency', ENV10 'Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy', HSG1 'New Housing Development', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG7 'Housing for Special Needs', HSG9 'Density Standards', HSG10 'Dwelling Mix', M10 'Parking for Development', OS2 'Metropolitan Open Lane', OS5 'Development adjacent to Open Space', OS6 'Ecologically Valuable Sites', OS16 'Green Chains' and OS17 'Tree Protection' of the adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan and with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 'Design Guidance and Design Statements', SPG3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floor Space Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes', SPG3b 'Privacy / Overlooking, Aspect / Outlook and Daylight / Sunlight', SPG8a 'Waste and Recycling', SPG10 'The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' and SPG 12 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing Development'.</p> <p>Section 106 Yes</p>	
<b>PC134.</b>	<p><b>673 LORDSHIP LANE N22</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>PC135.</b>	<p><b>48 OAKFIELD ROAD N4</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>PC136.</b>	<p><b>2 OSSIAN ROAD N4</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>PC137.</b>	<p><b>2 OSSIAN ROAD N4 ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>PC138.</b>	<p><b>THE NARROW BOAT PUBLIC HOUSE &amp; 146-152 REEDHAM CLOSE N17</b></p> <p>This item was deferred to the next meeting.</p>	
<b>PC139.</b>	<p><b>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</b></p> <p>There were no new items of urgent business.</p>	
<b>PC140.</b>	<p><b>SITE VISITS</b></p> <p>The next site visits will take place on Friday 29 February 2008 at 9:30am.</p>	
<b>PC141.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>Monday 3 March 2008</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 2008**

	The meeting concluded at 10:00pm	
--	----------------------------------	--

**COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK**  
Chair