

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 28 JULY 2014**

Councillors: Ahmet (Chair), Akwasi-Ayisi, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Carter, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Patterson, Rice and Stennett

<b>PC51.</b>	<b>PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS</b>  This meeting was scheduled to consider pre-application presentations to the Planning Sub-Committee and discussion of proposals.  Notwithstanding that this was a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no decisions were taken at the meeting and any subsequent applications will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with standard procedures.
<b>PC52.</b>	<b>COUNCIL HOUSING SITES</b>  The sites constituted the first tranche of a Council new build programme.  <b>Land between 10 and 12 Muswell Hill Place</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Two design options were being considered; one plain brick and one white rendered to reflect neighbouring properties. Cllr Ahmet expressed her view that the white rendered version was the preferred option that was agreed to go forward at a previous meeting. Some concerns were expressed by other Councillors that the white rendered design would suffer over time from discolouration to the base. The potential could be considered of introducing a brickwork design to the base to mitigate this.</li><li>• Clarification was required as to whether any prescribed car parking rights had been established on the site.</li><li>• Concerns were expressed regarding the use of flat roof construction as opposed to pitched. Officers advised that the roof would have a min 1:60 fall and provided assurance that the design and construction of modern flat roofs had greatly improved, with 25 year warranties even available in some instances.</li><li>• Members stressed that the development would need to conform to London Plan space standards. Officers identified that this had been an error within the report and provided assurance that compliance would be required.</li></ul> <b>Land adjacent to 82 Muswell Hill Place</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cllr Rice expressed concern that the development would be marketed for private sale when there was a considerable waiting list for Council housing. Officers identified that the capital receipt realised from the sale would be used to fund the rest of the programme and that the remaining properties built in this first tranche would be Council rented. Cllr Rice agreed to pick the point up with the Chair outside of the meeting.</li></ul> <b>Ednam House garages</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It was advised that Councillors had previously asked that the proposed design be revised to incorporate a more traditional porch and bay window design and to reconsider the provision of a green roof in light of concerns over maintenance.</li></ul>

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 28 JULY 2014**

	<p><b>Barnes Court parking area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In terms of design, it was advised that officers had requested that consideration be given to a more traditional roof design and the provision of a greater number of windows to the gable end.</li></ul>
<p><b>PC53.</b></p>	<p><b>FORMER HIGHGATE POLICE STATION, MAGISTRATES COURT, &amp; TELFER HOUSE, ARCHWAY ROAD LONDON N6 4NW</b></p> <p>The main areas of concern for officers were bulk and height, parking and the number of units proposed.</p> <p>It was anticipated that the design would go before a Development Management Forum meeting in early September. A number of community design workshop sessions had already been held.</p> <p>Cllr Hare as a local ward Councillor raised a number of objections to the proposed scheme including the height, the building line on Bishops Road, the size of the courtyard amenity space, the number of units, the visibility of the development from Highgate Woods and lack of opportunity for screening via mature trees.</p> <p>Members made the following comments on the scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern that the height (7 storeys at the apex) would set a precedent for future developments in the area. Officers confirmed that they had only received a copy of the proposed design at a late stage and had yet to give formal consideration to the design and height proposed. It was advised however that the site would be suited to a landmark building.</li><li>• It was queried whether the social housing would be pepperpotted through the development. The developers confirmed the intention for the scheme to be tenure blind internally and externally, with the social housing units contained within a defined core to allow for ease of management. It was advised that social housing providers were often reluctant to manage pepperpotted units.</li><li>• The allocation of parking was questioned, particularly for the affordable housing units. The developers informed that although that level of detailed planning had yet to be undertaken, it was anticipated that the allocation would be tenure blind, with a preference towards the larger family sized units.</li><li>• Concerns were expressed over the high value of the land and the subsequent impact on the developer's financial viability calculations in determining the level of affordable housing to be provided.</li><li>• Members queried whether the number of proposed units could be reduced. The developers advised that a 9 unit reduction had already been made from the initial plan and that it was likely that the scheme would not be viable with any fewer.</li></ul>
<p><b>PC54.</b></p>	<p><b>ST ANN'S GENERAL HOSPITAL, ST ANN'S ROAD, LONDON, N15 3TH</b></p> <p>It was anticipated that the planning application for the proposed development would be submitted for determination by Planning Committee in September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In response to Member concern regarding the retention of health services</li></ul>

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 28 JULY 2014**

	<p>on the site, representatives from the Trust confirmed that all existing NHS services would be retained and, by virtue of the redevelopment of the site, accommodated within new purpose built buildings with improved facilities. This included healthcare services provided by third parties such as the Moorfield eye service onsite etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Members sought an update on the progress of discussions to determine the proposed affordable housing provision onsite. It was advised that the Trust were currently in the process of updating the build costs for the new inpatient building which would feed into the viability assessments used to determine affordable housing levels. The Trust's objective would be to achieve a balance between releasing funding for the new mental health service buildings and other costs as well as affordable housing. Confirmation was provided that the figures would be available in advance of the Planning Committee meeting determining the application and would be subject to independent audit by the Council.</li><li>• Concerns were expressed over the consequences of dividing the site into development parcels, potentially in the hands of separate developers thereby risking a disjointed approach with a lack of overall co-ordination. The applicant identified that any outline permission granted and reserved matters determinations would allow the Council to ensure the cohesion of the redevelopment of the site. It was also stated that a design code could be conditioned.</li><li>• The applicant confirmed that the intention would be to pepperpot affordable housing units across the site and divide the allocation of parking between private sale and affordable housing units.</li><li>• In response to questions it was advised that initial design plans proposed a mix of integrated and exposed balconies. At this stage it was not proposed that cladding or render would be used as part of the design for the housing units.</li></ul>
<b>PC55.</b>	<b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b>  The next scheduled Committee would be a pre-application briefing session on 2 September.

COUNCILLOR AHMET

Chair