

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

PRESENT :

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

Also Present: Councillors Bull, C. Harris

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PC173.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
PC174.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	
PC175.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Bevan declared a prejudicial interest in agenda Item 12 – 7 Orchard Place, N17. Councillor Bevan advised that he would withdraw from the proceedings at the commencement of Item 12 – and return only to give his objections to the application then withdraw again for the remainder of the item.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	
PC176.	<p>DEPUTATIONS/PETITIONS</p> <p>There were no deputations or petitions.</p> <p>NOTED</p>	
PC177.	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 1 April 2008 be agreed and signed as an accurate record of the proceedings.</p>	
PC178.	<p>APPEAL DECISIONS</p> <p>The Committee noted the outcome of 5 appeal decisions determined by the Department for Communities and Local Government during March 2008, of which 3 (60%) were allowed and 2 (40%) were dismissed.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>The Committee was asked to note that there were 3 enforcement appeals, 1 was dismissed - 20 Concord House, Park Lane, N17 0JQ, and 2 were allowed – 30 Cholmeley Crescent N6 5HA, and land at rear of 1-21 Daleview Road, London N15 6PL. .</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p>PC179.</p>	<p>DELEGATED DECISIONS</p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the decisions made under delegated powers by the Heads of Development Control (North and South) and the Chair of the Planning Committee determined between 17 March 2008 and 13 April 2008.</p> <p>Councillor Adamou referred to the delegated decisions in relation to 85 Burgoyne Road, and 22 Duckett Road, and expressed her surprise at both being allowed given that there were a large number of HMO's in the area already, and also that the UDP stated that there should be no conversions in this particular area but it would appear that planning officers were ignoring the UDP by allowing this.</p> <p>The Chair asked, and officers agreed to respond to both Councillor Adamou and the Chair in writing as to the reasoning for allowing both applications, and also report back to the next Committee.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. That the report be noted; and ii. That the reasoning for allowing two HMO applications at 85 Burgoyne Road,N4 and 22 Duckett Road, N4., be conveyed in writing to Cllr Adamou, and copied to the Chair, and reported to the next meeting of the Committee. 	
<p>PC180.</p>	<p>PERFORMANCE STATISTICS</p> <p>The Committee was asked to note the performance statistics on Development Control and Planning Enforcement Work since the previous Planning Committee of 1 April 2008.</p> <p>The Committee were advised that 3 out of 4 major applications were determined within 13 weeks (75%), and 31 out of 41 cases (76%) of minor applications were determined within 8 weeks, slightly below the Haringey performance target. In respect of</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>other applications 130 out of 144 cases (90%) were determined within 8 weeks which was above the Haringey target.</p> <p>There being no questions from the Committee it was :-</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the report be noted.</p>	
<p>PC181.</p>	<p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</p>	
<p>PC182.</p>	<p>WOOD GREEN SHOPPING CITY, HIGH ROAD N22</p> <p>The Committee was advised that the application site formed part of the Mall Shopping City which consisted of a covered three-level shopping mall, a multi-plex cinema, multi-storey car parks, a recently vacated petrol filling station and service yards and residential and office space. The proposal before the Planning Committee was for a variation to condition 9 relating to the hours of delivery to service yards. The original application included a condition implementing the hours of delivery to be outside the hours of 7am-7pm Monday – Saturday with no deliveries on Sundays and Bank Holidays, and a further application was then received for 24 hrs delivery and this was refused planning permission. The variation now applied for was to allow operation between 0700-2100hrs Monday to Friday, 0800-2100hrs on Saturdays and 0900 – 1800 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>The Committee were advised that because the applicant was not proposing early morning or late night deliveries it was anticipated that there should not be much additional disturbance to residents.</p> <p>The Committee questioned the reasons why the extension and need for flexibility in the delivery times had arisen, and the size of the vehicle. In response officers advised that the applicant had expressed the need for delivery on Sundays in order for stock to be available on Mondays to meet customer demands. It was the case that all other stores had deliveries 24/7. Given the proximity of the site, delivery was requested up to 9pm, and Sundays/Bank holidays.</p> <p>The Committee further commented on the effects of the increase in deliveries to the store and the fact that the variation had been requested even before the store had been completed and opened, and the fact that the goods to be delivered were non perishable. Clarification was also sought as to the deliveries to other shops in the mall and whether it was possible for deliveries to be made to these stores from the same delivery vehicles, therefore cutting the</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

number of deliveries in total to the Mall.

In response the Committee were advised that as the different retailers in the mall had different suppliers it was not possible to consolidate delivery services. Also the increased effect of deliveries would have no greater effect on the level of traffic and noise that residents had experienced when the former petrol station had been in use. The Committee commented that the noise levels from the former petrol station and noise from cars was significantly different from, and could not be compared to the noise that would result in the increase in vehicle deliveries given their size, as well as their proximity to residential dwellings.

In response to further questions the Committee were advised that the service and storage yards were the furthest away from Caxton Road, and that noise levels from idling vehicles was envisaged to be minimal in terms of residence disturbance.

Local residents addressed the Committee and objected to the application on the basis that:

- That the proposed variation had been applied for even before the development had been built without any actual rationale as to whether the variation would be required;
- The proposed operation would mean delivery 365 days a year which would result in an invasion of local residents' privacy and their quality of life and wellbeing being affected especially on weekends, bank holidays and at evening time by the resultant increase in noise levels due to increased usage;
- That the former petrol station usage and levels of noise could not be in any way compared to the likely noise levels if the variation was allowed as the level of noise/vibration from HGV's was considerably higher than car noise/vibration, and that the former petrol station had not been used during the evenings;
- The level of officer consultation to the proposed variation had been minimal, and the effects of the impact of HGV's on the two roads affected, as well as the local feeder roads would be considerable;
- That the noise levels from the actual shopping mall and High Road were not a comparison of noise levels at the rear of the shopping mall and that it was accepted that there would be high noise levels in a shopping/high street area.

Councillor C Harris spoke in her capacity as Ward Member, and in support of the objections to the proposed variation. In sharing a number of the views expressed by the residents

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

Councillor Harris commented that the proposed variation would mean an increase in HGV usage in an area where traffic noise was considerable, and the effects that the HGV usage and traffic pressure that the proposed operation would create in the smaller streets in the vicinity would be considerable. Councillor Harris commented that she had been present in the homes of two different residents in vicinity of the shopping mall, and could personally vouch for the noise levels. Councillor Harris concluded by urging the Committee to refuse the application on the grounds of the detrimental effect on local residents in the areas immediately, and close to the rear of the shopping mall.

The Committee then viewed the plans.

The Chair then asked if there were any point so clarification or comment.

The Committee were advised by the Planning Officer that in respect of the actual consultation and responses received it was the case that there had been forty five identical letters of objection, and four individual letters, with no responses from residents of Caxton Road where the main increase in traffic noise would be felt. In response to clarification the Committee were advised that the HGV vehicles would come along the spine road to Mayes Road and take a turning right taking traffic off Hornsey Park Road.

The Committee were further advised by the Transportation Planner that the HGV noise levels at the Tottenham Hale retail park had been examined and the HGV usage and that there were 6/5 HGV a day maximum and generally the deliveries were mornings to early afternoon. The traffic noise levels at Wood Green were likely to be in the region of 60% less than the retail park.

Following further discussion a MOTION was moved to grant the application.

On a vote there being 2 for and 4 against the MOTION to grant the application was refused.

The Chair advised that in refusing the application the Committee would be required to give clear reasons for the refusal.

The Committee then;

RESOLVED:

That the application for a variation of condition 9 (hours of

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>delivery to service yards) attached to planning reference HGY/2007/0500 to allow operation between 0700-2100 Monday to Friday, 0800-2100 on Saturdays, and 0900-1800hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays be refused on the grounds that the application would have an unacceptable impact on the quality of life for residents and on the quality of their amenity due to noise and vibration extending into a sensitive time of the day in the evenings, and extending over 365 days.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2008/0467 FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/05/2008</p> <p>Location: Wood Green Shopping City, High Road N22</p> <p>Proposal: Variation of Condition 9 (hours of delivery to service yards) attached to planning reference HGY/2007/0500 to allow operation between 0700 - 2100hrs Monday to Friday, 0800 - 2100hrs on Saturdays, and 0900 - 1800hrs on Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Recommendation: Refused</p> <p>Decision: Refused</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <p>1. The proposed variation of condition to extend the operational hours of delivery within the new service yard 5, would give rise to noise and disturbance to nearby residential properties extending to 365 days a year, particularly at evenings and on Sundays when residents would have a reasonable expectation of quiet enjoyment of their properties. The applicants have failed to demonstrate why deliveries cannot be made within the permitted 12-hour periods on 6 days of the week. As such the proposal would be detrimental to residential amenity and contrary to Policy 4A.14 'Reducing Noise' of the London Plan (2004), and in Policy ENV6 'Noise Pollution' of the Adopted Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p>PC183.</p>	<p>591 LORDSHIP LANE N22</p> <p>The Committee were advised that the site was on the south side of Lordship Lane between Coldham Court and Andrula Court. The application proposal had been for demolition of existing building and erection of 3/4 storey building comprising 1 x one bed, 1 x three bed and 5 x two bed flats with associated landscaping. The current proposal was to add 1 x 1-bedroom flat on the ground floor</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

of the approved building by subdividing the original 3-bedroom flat on the ground floor into a 3-bedroom flat and a one-bedroom flat, making a total of 7 flats in the development rather than 6. Both flats would have direct access to garden space. The envelope of the building as approved in 2007 would remain the same as there was no increase in size or bulk.

The Committee were further advised that at the time of submission of the application the original building had been demolished and the site cleared but the new building approved in 2007 had not been built, and as a result an application for the change of use of the ground floor flat into 2 flats was not possible as this flat still did not exist, and a new application for the whole building, with the variation of the additional flat, had to be submitted. The application was also a car free development.

The Committee were also advised that the earlier permission was subject to a Section 106 Agreement requiring financial contributions for educational provision, environmental improvements and amendments to Traffic Management Orders. These contributions had been paid before the issue of the planning permission and the addition of one non-family unit did not give rise to any requirement for additional contributions. The development remained below the threshold for provision of affordable housing. There was therefore no requirement for a fresh agreement to accompany this decision. However, the Planning Officer advised that a Deed of Variation should be entered into to ensure that the obligations in the Section 106 Agreement for the previous scheme are binding on the amended scheme.

In response to points of clarification from the Committee officers advised that the change in specification in flat sizes was viewed as more likely to attract usage for small families. The size of the rooms in each dwelling was of adequate size, and consultation had taken place in the near vicinity though the site was opposite the park and therefore the development was not overlooked as such.

The Committee referred to provision of cycling storage and whether this could be included within the development. The Committee also commented that in terms of cycle storage there should be a check in terms of those applications where a cycle provision had been included and built, and the actual usage of the facility.

RESOLVED

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

That the application be granted subject to conditions and subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:
HGY/2008/0263
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/05/2008

Location: 591 Lordship Lane N22

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of 3/4 storey building comprising 1 x one bed, 1 x three bed and 5 x two bed flats with associated landscaping.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: 64/SP/01; 64/PP/01, 02, 03, 05, 06, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12 [all Rev 07]; 64/SCH/01rev 07.

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 windows on the top floor (rear) south elevation of the building, as shown on the approved plans, shall be glazed with obscure glass and shall be so maintained unless prior written consent of the local planning authority is obtained.

Reason: In the interests of the privacy of adjoining occupiers.

4. Details of the proposed boundary treatment including all walls, fencing, gateways and means of access shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to completion of the development hereby approved, such detailed work to be carried out as approved prior to occupation of the building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and to safeguard the visual amenity of the locality.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

5. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall be submitted 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 protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood.

6. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development to include detailed drawings of:

- a. those existing trees to be retained.
- b. those existing trees to be removed.
- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be agreed with the Council's Arboriculturalist.
- d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

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.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>8. Notwithstanding the details shown on the ground floor plan of the proposed development, further detailed drawings of the refuse and cycle stores to be provided shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, such details as approved to be implemented prior to the occupation of the building. Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory form of development.</p> <p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>The external design, and envelope of the building remains as previously permitted and the addition of one non-family flat does not constitute overdevelopment, and the scheme therefore complies sufficiently with Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' of the Council's Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes</p>	
<p>PC184.</p>	<p>7 ORCHARD PLACE N17</p> <p>Councillor Bevan, having declared a prejudicial interest, left the proceedings at 20.08hrs.</p> <p>The Committee were informed by officers that the application site was situated at 7 Orchard Place outside the conservation area. The site was currently a two storey builders office with a single storey extension to the rear, adjacent to a yard for car repairs etc and the railway line to the west and a row of 3 storey residential houses to the east. To the rear of the site there were very tall conifer trees (15m).</p> <p>The Committee were advised that the proposal was a resubmission for the demolition of the existing builders offices and redevelopment of the site to provide a 3 storey building comprising 2 x 3 bed flats on the ground floor and 4 x two bed self contained flats on the first and first and second floor constructed in roof tiles and facing brickwork, with 3 parking space. The amendments involved in the revised scheme involved the alteration of the dwelling mix, 3 car parking spaces and evidence submitted to show that the site has been advertised on the market for employment use over a period of 18 months.</p> <p>The Committee, in noting the previous period of marketing for employment use, sought clarification as to whether the site could be marketed now for employment use at a price appropriate to the area and therefore possibly attracting a level of interest.</p> <p>In response officers advised the Committee that the site had been marketed by 3 different Estate agents who had marketed the site over an 18 month period with no interest shown during this</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

period. The market price had been £375K, which a reasonable price for marketing such premises in this area. The site had had full marketing and each of the Estate Agents had done this in good faith.

Councillor Bevan re-entered the proceedings and addressed the Committee as an objector to the application.

Councillor Bevan commented that he had 4 main points of objection to the application. He referred to the size of some of the units – with 56 square metres (sqm) and 65 sqm, being substantial shortfalls to the required minimum floor space area. Councillor Bevan also commented on the loss of employment use, as there was a huge demand for units such as this in Tottenham. Councillor Bevan also referred to the suitability of this site for residential use giving the nuisance that could be caused by the adjacent railway line, as well as the matter of overlooking and daylight issues to adjacent properties.

Councillor Bevan also referred to the marketing of the site and whether the site had seriously been marketed as a possible employment site and in a proactive manner in the past 18 months.

In response to points of clarification from the Committee Councillor Bevan responded that the opportunity for employment at the site would be dependant on the type of business, and he felt that such a site would be appropriate for a builder's merchants/yard. With regard to room sizes the prescribed size was 73 sqm and the actual room sizes was 65 sqm which was substantially less.

There being no further questions from the Committee Councillor Bevan withdrew from the proceedings (20.25hrs).

The Committee were advised by officers that in terms of the issue of room size it was the case that the guidance was not rigid and it was the case that on a number of appeal cases Inspectors were not supporting every square metre lost. In this particular application the flat sizes were below the 73 sqm but in the majority of the flats only 4sqm.

In response to clarification, the Committee were advised by officers in respect of parking and highways issues.

The Committee decided to grant the application unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the application be granted subject to conditions and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure an

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

education contribution of £40420.85 and an administration costs contribution of £2021.00.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:
HGY/2008/0462
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/05/2008

Location: 7 Orchard Place N17

Proposal: Redevelopment of site to provide 3 storey building comprising 2 x three bed and 4 x two bed self-contained flats with 3 no car parking spaces.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement

Drawing No's: 01 Rev D & photographs.

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. 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
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

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.

6. A suitable soundproofing scheme to provide effective resistance to the transmission of airborne sound from the adjacent railway shall be submitted to, approved in writing by, and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority for all compartment floors and party walls prior to the occupation of the premises.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed conversion does not give rise to an unacceptable loss of amenity for occupiers within the property as a result of inadequate soundproofing.

7. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage within the site 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.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

8. 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.

9. 6 cycle racks should be provided, and shall be enclosed within a secure shelter.

Reason: to encourage cycling as a means of transport.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 4 (1) and Part 25 of Schedule 2 of the 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 / aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for the residential units created: details of such a scheme shall be submitted 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.

11. Details of the hard surfacing for the car parking area and footpaths in front of the proposed building shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development; such details shall include the provision of permeable paving or surfacing.

Reason: In order that the Council shall be satisfied as to the external appearance of the frontage to the property.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>INFORMATIVE: Further to Condition 4 above concerning Landscaping: the Council wishes to see not less than two new trees planted in the frontage to the site, in addition to appropriate shrub or lawned areas.</p> <p>REASONS FOR APPROVAL</p> <p>It is felt that the previous reasons for refusal have been addressed for the following reasons; it is felt that residential is appropriate on the site as other existing residential buildings are in close proximity to the yard and the railway line. Also evidence has been submitted with the scheme to show that the site has been advertised on the market for employment use over a period of 18 months, the overall layout is satisfactory, the proposal would relate satisfactorily to the scale and character of the existing adjacent block, there would be no adverse impact on the neighbouring properties, there is sufficient car parking on the site and. As such the proposal is in accordance with Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', HSG 1 'New Housing Developments', HSG 2 'Change of Use to Residential', M10 'Parking for Development' and the Councils SPG 1 'Design Guidance' and SPG 3a 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes</p>	
<p>PC185.</p>	<p>SIXTH FORM CENTRE, WHITE HART LANE N17</p> <p>In a brief introduction of the report the Committee were advised that planning permission had been granted for the sixth form centre in October 2005, (HGY2005/1439) as part of a wider scheme including new housing and a new care home. The residential element was now completed and occupied called Academia Way. The application sought the extension of the opening hours of the sixth form centre from those allowed in the original planning permission. Condition E4 attached to that permission allowed the centre to open between 0700 and 2200 hours Monday – Friday, 0800 and 1800 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays. It was now proposed to open the centre from 0700 to 2300 on every day. The intention of the proposal was to encourage increased community use and make the facilities more accessible to local people in line with the advice from central government and policies G3 and CW1 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006. It was considered that, as any issues associated with the running of the sixth form centre were included as part of an ongoing programme of initiatives by the sixth form centre to ensure good relations with the local community, that the issues raised by local residents would be addressed and the facilities within the sixth form centre would be seen to provide a valuable resource for local people in line with</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

policy UD3 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

The Chair asked if there were any comments from the Committee.

The Committee sought clarification as to whether the granting could be conditional on a 2 year period, in order to assess take up, and whether a condition could be added in respect of the issue of crowd control and dispersal, and litter clearing and noise monitoring. In response to both points the Committee were advised that the Committee could limit the operation up to a two year period, and that in terms of the issue of crowd control and dispersal, and litter clearing and noise monitoring this could be added not as a condition but as an informative.

The Committee then heard from Somerset Hall residents objecting to the proposed variation in the following terms:

- That the levels of noise and litter/mess arising from the existing hours operation caused much distress to local residents, and increases in service charges in order to clear litter/mess caused by students;
- That there had been damage to resident vehicles and property;
- Evidence of smoking illegal substances in the vicinity close to residents homes, as well as drug dealing;
- That the effects of the existing facility on local residents had reached an unacceptable level;
- That the concerns expressed to the College had not been taken seriously and no effective measures had been put in place by the College to combat the levels of noise, disturbance and damage to vehicles and homes;
- The need to have adequate fencing with the cost being shared between the residents and the college;
- The need for students to be constantly reminded of the need to ensure noise levels were kept to a minimum at all times and the emphasis that Somerset place was a place of residents, and that proper consultation take place with the College, local residents and the Council to ensure that concerns are taken account of should the application be granted.

The Chair, in thanking local residents for their address, asked if there were any comments from the Committee. The Committee commented in response to some concerns expressed by stating that the college was not going to be used by students during the extended hours but would be used for adult and community usage, and would be a valuable asset to the area as a result, and should be encouraged. A number of the concerns relating to the existing problems would surely be allayed by this usage. The Committee also commented that there needed to be better

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

dialogue between residents and the management of the 6th form centre in respect of the issues raised by residents.

The Committee heard in response from residents that there needed to be far better consultation from the College and that there had to be a degree of recognition to the existing problems that local residents experienced throughout the day with students from the college. The Committee were further advised by residents of incidents of gang fighting/drug dealing, and the lack of response from Police Community Support Officers when incidents had been reported.

The Chair then asked the Principle of the 6th Form Centre to address the Committee in support of the application.

Ms Jarrett advised the Committee that in terms of some of the incidents referred to by local residents it was the case that the College had on no occasion not dealt with, nor investigated any incidents reported by residents. Indeed since the previous September there had been a small number of complaints received and that she had been unaware that further incidents near the vicinity of Somerset Gardens had occurred and any previous issues had been dealt with. There was also an on-site police officer who monitored the premises and activities both in, and surrounding the college. Ms Jarrett therefore commented that she strongly objected to some of the comments expressed. The issue of noise levels and litter were emphasised at Assemblies and that the teachers at the college themselves over a period of months had carried out patrols during break and lunch times, following the reporting of incidents the previous autumn. Ms Jarrett further advised that college students were bounded by a code of conduct and that the use of drugs, the practice of vandalism/graffiti was totally unacceptable and explicitly stated in the code of conduct.

In response to points of clarification Ms Jarrett advised that the sports events would be supervised by Haringey Leisure Services and that the activities would be attracting a much older age group. In terms of trialling the activities for a 1 or 2 year period it was the case that the SLA was being sought for a 5 year period in order to ensure positive usage/take up, and the operation then being able to be cost effective, and that the operators were not minded to have anything less than the 5 year period.

The Chair advised that Councillor Bull would speak in support of the application.

Councillor Bull advised, in stating that he fully endorsed and supported the recommendations before the Committee, it was evident that there had been issues of miscommunication between the local residents and the college. Councillor Bull commented on

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

the need for such a community usage in the north Tottenham area which was much needed and he envisaged good usage. If the Committee were to grant the application then there needed to be better lines of communication and dialogue and he advised the Committee that he would work with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People – Councillor Santry – to ensure that there was open dialogue and exchange of views, and that perhaps a steering group of Ward Councillor, the College and local residents, chaired by Councillor Santry could be established.

Councillor Dodds particularly supported the comments of Councillor Bull in respect of the need to have a dialogue and understanding between all interested parties, and would welcome the establishment of such a steering group. He also commented on the issue of drug dealing and that this would be taken up further with Councillor Santry and ensure that the Police were further aware of this concern.

The residents concluded their comments by stating that the area in question was where they had chosen to live in and it was being disrupted and this had a detrimental effect on their lives and well being. The Committee were urged not to agree the application but defer until such time as appropriate levels of consultation had been carried out with residents.

The Committee supported the suggestion by Councillor Bull to have a multi-agency working group to discuss the issues commented on by residents in order for the issues to worked through, with Councillor Santry leading on this group.

The Chair then MOVED that the recommendations as detailed in the report be approved.

Councillor Hare MOVED an amendment to the MOTION to restrict the period of operation for 2 years. On a VOTE there being 1 for and 6 against the amendment.

The substantive MOTION was put to the vote. There being 5 for, and nil against, and 4 abstentions it was:

RESOLVED

That the variation of condition E4 attached to Planning permission HGY2005/1439 relating to extended operating hours be approved.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:
HGY/2008/0314
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 06/05/2008

Location: Sixth Form Centre, White Hart Lane N17

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>Proposal: Variation of Condition E4 attached to planning permission HGY/2005/1439 (creation of Haringey 6th Form Centre) to allow opening between 0700 - 2300hrs every day, including the sports centre and theatre and restaurant facilities.</p> <p>Recommendation: Grant permission</p> <p>Decision: Grant permission</p> <p>Drawing No's: 1204 105 P1 & 106 P1.</p> <p>Conditions:</p> <p>1. No conditions.</p> <p>Section 106: No</p>	
<p>PC186.</p>	<p>WOOD GREEN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT</p> <p>In a brief introduction of the report the Head of Economic Regeneration Ms Galey advised the Committee that the Wood Green Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF), and part of the framework for the development of Wood Green town centre by providing guidance on development sites, urban design and a sustainable long term vision. Ms Galey advised that following extensive initial consultation with Members, businesses, residents associations, strategic partners and stakeholders a draft SPD has been prepared for Wood Green town centre and the key sites identified within its boundaries. The draft document was now subject to a statutory public consultation for the duration of up to six weeks before a final version of the document was presented for adoption in September 2008.</p> <p>In respect of the proposed statutory consultation process, the strategy, if approved by Committee, the statutory public consultation would be launched at The Mall shopping centre on the 19 May 2008 and thereafter, be located in the Wood Green Library for a period of 6 weeks. During this time a dedicated information stand was to be erected with an accompanying comments box to encourage all visitors to submit their views and opinions. The stand would be open fully to all members of the public during the opening hours of the library. Full details of the project, consultation and project time-scales were also provided on the dedicated website which would also be used as a portal for receiving comments from the upcoming public consultation.</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

The Committee commented in relation to:

- the mix of properties proposed and whether there had been any ascertaining of the required flat sizes given the 4000/5000 people currently in temporary accommodation and their requirements;
- the consultation process needing to address users at night time in terms of those that use the night clubs and other facilities were likely from outside the area and different to daytime users;
- the usage of the identified space by the PCT and their requirements in terms of space.
- Concerns at the traffic proposals through Wood Green and the filter road at the River Park House junction and the resultant difficulties with this.

In response Ms Galey advised that consultation would take place with planning services as regards to the housing requirements in terms of the recently completed housing SPD. In terms of consultation there would be a 6 week process as well as a full weekend of consultation in the Shopping Centre. Also people could view the website and give comment. With regard to night-time users officers would carry out a consultation with night-club owners as to usage. In respect of the PCT there had been extensive discussion with the PCT with regard to the type of facility and requirements. However the PCT had now had advised that it was not interested in the identified site for use. As a result officers would leave the identified as an optional usage. In respect of the highways issues Ms Galey advised that officers from the transport service would advise on proposed changes and the impact of these as part of a traffic impact assessment.

The Chair then asked the Committee if it were in agreement.

The Legal Representative present advised the Committee that legal advice had been given to the report author the previous week regarding the proposals before the Committee. In effect this had been that whilst this Committee could agree to the process of consultation, it was the Cabinet/Executive that had to agree and authorise the actual planning consultation. This advice was currently being clarified by the report author and should it be necessary to seek the approval of the Cabinet then the decision of this Committee would be subject to that approval.

In response to points of clarification the Committee was advised that it was able to consider the recommendations before it and agree them with additional comments, which would then be considered by the Cabinet if this course of

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 6 MAY 2008**

	<p>action was required.</p> <p>On a MOTION by the Chair it was:</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the draft Wood Green Supplementary Planning Document be approved for 6 week statutory public consultation, subject to officers taking account of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the mix of properties proposed and whether there had been any ascertaining of the required flat sizes given the number of people currently in temporary accommodation and their housing requirements; • the consultation process needing to address users at night time in terms of those that use the night clubs and other facilities were likely from outside the area and different to daytime users; • Concerns at the traffic proposals through Wood Green and in particular the filter road at the River Park House junction and the resultant difficulties with this. 	
<p>PC187.</p>	<p>NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>Nil items.</p>	
<p>PC188.</p>	<p>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</p> <p>To be confirmed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The meeting ended at 21.30hrs.</p>	

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK
Chair