

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16 MARCH 2016

PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), Vincent Carroll (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, David Beacham, Clive Carter, Toni Mallett, James Patterson, James Ryan and Elin Weston

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred Members present to agenda item 1 as shown on the agenda in respect of filming at the meeting, and Members noted the information contained therein.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bevan and Cllr Doron.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Ahmet declared a personal interest as Ward Councillor for Noel Park, in which capacity she had met with the developers for the Land at Haringey Heartlands site previously, as part of the residents and business liaison group.

5. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The Chair outlined the pre-application process, and advised that following the review of the protocol, Ward Councillors were now permitted to address the meeting in respect of pre-applications, for up to 3 minutes each.

6. LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS, BETWEEN HORNSEY PARK ROAD, MAYES ROAD, CLARENDON ROAD AND THE KINGS CROSS / EAST COAST MAINLINE

Noted that this was a pre-application for Reserved Matters relating to an existing outline planning permission approved in 2009. The Committee was given a brief summary of the feedback from the Quality Review Panel (QRP), which had looked at it earlier in the day and for which formal notes were not yet available. The summary QRP feedback was:

- The parameters of the masterplan as set out in the approved outline planning permission were restrictive; delivering a quality scheme would be challenging within these constraints.
- An increased number of cores was recommended.
- There should be more intense focus on the public realm, and greater consideration given to the public square at the north of the site.
- More consideration should be given to the use of small open spaces and whether these could be used as gardens for the ground floor flats. Consideration should also be given to duplex units at ground floor level.
- More thought was required in respect of the parking strategy.

Cllr Stephen Mann addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for this pre-application, and raised the following points:

- Engagement between the developers and residents through the residents and business liaison group had been positive and it was hoped that this would continue.
- This was a large development in an area with already congested roads and thought therefore needed to be given to the parking strategy and transport arrangements.
- Residents understood that open space would constitute 30% of the development, and it was hoped that the new 'pocket park' would be in addition to this. It was also hoped that delivery of the pocket park could be guaranteed by means of the Section 106 agreement.
- Consideration was needed for how the open spaces would be maintained, and it was suggested that this could also be addressed as part of the Section 106.
-

The following points were raised by the Committee:

- Further details were required regarding school places and health services and how these would be delivered. These were covered under the Section 106 agreement for the previously approved outline scheme. Discussions would need to be held with the Education Service regarding how they envisaged the s106 funding being allocated to deliver the number of additional school places required. In terms of health provision, it was reported that the outline scheme included a space for use as a health facility, and that this would be offered to the CCG in the first instance.
- In response to a question about bicycle parking, it was reported that this was planned for 100% of units, so around 1,050.
- The Committee asked about the likely dwelling mix and it was reported that this was 75.6% private and 24.4% affordable. Of the private accommodation, the mix was estimated as 50% 1 bed units, 40% 2 bed units and 5% 3 bed units, and for the affordable housing, the mix was estimated as 15% 1 bed units, 43% 2 bed units, 32% 3 bed units and 10% 4 bed units.
- The Committee asked about the links with Alexandra Palace; although development was constrained by the parameter plans, it was intended that the £0.5m contribution towards open space would include some contribution within Alexandra Park and would also seek to create a sense of linkage with Alexandra Palace. Negotiations were also taking place with Thames Water

- regarding the potential use of the pedestrian tunnel under the railway to give access from Wood Green to Alexandra Palace through the site.
- It was noted that the proposed pressure reduction system, subject of a current s73 application to be determined shortly, would be surrounded by a 2m high brick wall, incorporating decorative detailing.
 - It was noted that the layout, number of blocks and heights was the same as granted in the outline planning permission. The developers outlined the proposals for three distinct zones within the prescribed layout, and how these would be treated architecturally.
 - The Committee asked why a completely new application had not been submitted. The developers advised that they wished to complete the outline application already granted by means of getting reserved matters consent, but that they would also subsequently consider the potential for developing a new and improved scheme.
 - The Committee asked about plans for local employment at construction stage, and it was reported that this was provided for in the section 106 agreement.
 - In terms of timescales, it was reported that a Development Management Forum was planned for May, and that the application was also likely to be submitted in May.

7. LAND BETWEEN NEW RIVER AND HAMPDEN ROAD (STEEL YARD AND WILMOTT HOUSE) N8

The Committee was given a brief summary of the feedback from the Quality Review Panel (QRP), which had looked at it earlier in the day and for which formal notes were therefore not yet available. The summary QRP feedback was:

- Generally supportive of the height and massing, subject to refinement and subject to a final views assessment, which was yet to be undertaken.
- The height needs further consideration in respect of the neighbours to the north of the site.
- Elevations to be refined to be more elegant in appearance.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion of this item:

- In response to a question about the proposed level of employment at the site, it was confirmed that 155m² of flexible commercial floor space was proposed, fronting onto Hampden Road. The Committee advised that employment at the site would be important, as the proposals were replacing an existing employment location.
- The Committee asked about the use of the rooms overlooking the railway, given the likely level of noise. It was reported that a mixture of rooms was proposed for this side of the site. Acoustic studies were being undertaken and the design of the building would take into account all of the relevant regulations and standards to address any noise from the railway. It was noted that the developer was very familiar with working on similar sites close to railway lines and therefore had experience in handling such issues.
- It was confirmed that parking was proposed at ground floor, rather than basement level, some under buildings and some in the space in-between. In response to concerns about the lack of surveillance, it was reported that

residential accommodation at ground floor level and balconies at first floor level would provide some degree of natural surveillance.

- Concerns were expressed about the potential impact on views from the other side of the river, in particular the Hillfield Conservation Area. The developers advised that views analysis of a number of key views, including nearby Conservation Areas and the Ladder, was currently being undertaken.
- Members noted that there were no other buildings 12 storeys tall in the nearby area, and that this would need to be taken into account.
- The Committee asked about the angled plan of the building at the southern edge of the site – the architect advised that this was to accommodate a sewer running across the site at this point, and allowed for the creation of a small garden which would add visual interest along Hampden Road.
- It was noted that the bridge across the railway line was owned by Network Rail and that any proposed changes affecting that area would need to be discussed with them as private owners of the land.
- In terms of timescales, it was expected that the application would be submitted at the end of April.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

4 April (provisional) and 9 May 2016.

The Committee noted that, although the business of the Planning Sub Committee was routine, there was the risk that an application considered during the purdah period could become politically contentious, especially as it was only the more complex items that were referred to the Committee for consideration, and that there were therefore restrictions on the meetings that could be held during this period.

The Chair noted that this was the last meeting of the Committee of David Merson, Legal Advisor to the Committee. The Chair and Committee thanked Mr Merson for all of his support to the Committee and wished him the very best for the future.

The meeting closed at 8.25pm.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair

Date