Felicity Foley,
Principal Committee
Co-ordinator

020 8489 2919

felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Monday, 13th November, 2017

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

3. URGENT BUSINESS (PAGES 1 - 6)

The Chair will consider the admission of any late items of urgent business. Late items will be considered under the agenda item where they appear. New items will be dealt with at item 9 below.

Yours sincerely

Felicity Foley, Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

1. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**
2. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Planning Sub Committee 13 November 2017

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM 5

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 6

Reference No: HGY/2016/2081	**Ward:** Crouch End
Address: 70-72 Shepherds Hill N6 5RH **Proposal:** Demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide 16 residential dwellings within a 5 storey buildings with associated landscaping, car parking and other associated works.	

DRAWINGS NUMBERS:

Sustainability Statement, Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report, Design and Access Statement, Energy Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, Heritage Statement, Supporting Planning Statement, Statement of Community Involvement, Daylight and Sunlight 09/11/2017, GA001, GA002, GA002, GA003 Rev A, GA 100, GA 101, GA 102, GA 103, GA 104, GA 110, GA 111, GA 120, GA 121, GA 122, GA 123, GA 124, GA 200 Rev A, GA 201 Rev A, GA 202 Rev A, GA 203 Rev A, GA 204 Rev A, GA 205 Rev A, GA 206, GA 300 Rev A, GA 310, GA 400 Rev A, GA 401 Rev A, GA 402 Rev A, GA 403 Rev A, GA 404 Rev A.

ADDITIONALTHIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

A late letter has been received from the Highgate Society (below), however this raises no new material considerations that have not already been considered.

IMPACT ON ADJOINING OCCUPIERS

Paragraph 6.6.5 of the published committee report states that 'glazing on the western flank of Altior Court is to a stairwell.' This should read 'glazing on the western flank of Altior Court is to habitable rooms.' However, given the distance between the proposal and Altior Court (which is 9.5m) the conclusion that there is no significant impact on the aforementioned windows stands.

In response to third party objections, the applicant has provided a daylight and sunlight assessment in addition to what is already been submitted, which has been authored by a Right of Light Surveyor. The report concludes that 'the proposed development will have a low impact on the light enjoyed at neighbouring properties. Right of Light Consulting confirms that the development design satisfies all of the requirements set out in the BRE guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight'. This aligns with officers' assessment of the impact of the development, which notes impacts to two windows in Dale Lodge that would be marginally below BRE Guidelines.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:

20. 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

Appendices:

70-72 Shepherds Hill, London N6 5RH - Planning reference HGY/2016/2081
Response from Highgate Society to Planning Sub Committee Report, 13th November 2017

This submission has been produced by the Society for circulation to members of the Planning Committee on 13th November. The report deals item by item with the item listed in the Committee Report to justify the demolition of the existing houses and their replacement with a 5 storey block.

The principle of a residential development is appropriate on this site and would provide additional housing.
Whilst it is accepted that residential use is appropriate for this site, and additional units are provided, the Society has major reservations as to the appropriateness of what is proposed. This development will provide 16 luxury flats in an area with already unaffordable property prices. This is indicated by the recently completed Highgate Court by Bellway on Archway Road which is largely empty, and by Estate Agents' statements about the number of unsold units in the immediate area, understood to be in the region of 40. There is therefore no demonstrable need for this type of housing in this location.

The design and appearance of the proposal would be of a high standard to justify both the demolition and the replacement of the existing building on the site.
The Society, together with other bodies such as Highgate CAAC, Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum and, notably, the Victorian Society strongly contest this assertion. This development, by removing the "break" between the adjoining blocks, will create a continuous wall of 5-6 story bulky blocks, lacking the articulation and low rise of the original buildings. The adjoining buildings 64, 66, 68, 74 and 76 Shepherd's Hill are designated detractors within the Conservation Area Appraisal and it is the bulk of the built form, regardless of the quality of the elevational treatment, which will have the negative effect on the street scape.

The proposed residential accommodation would be of an acceptable layout and standard.
The Society accepts that the plans appear to meet the current London Plan criteria

The existing building is considered a 'neutral' contributor within the conservation area in which the site is located.
Whilst the Conservation Area Appraisal does only designate the existing building as neutral, it is now several years old and has a number of major omissions, such as this. It is the Society's view that this is an incorrect designation and that it also does not take into consideration the harmful impact on the Conservation Area of removal of this last Victorian villa building in this part of the Shepherd's Hill Conservation Area.

It is therefore particularly important to bear in mind that the demolition of this building breaches clause 1.21 of the Appraisal which states that "*The area between Shepherd's Hill, Coolhurst Road and Hurst Avenue was included in the Conservation Area to protect the remaining original buildings within that area from demolition. This has resulted in the current boundary of the Crouch End Conservation Area.*" Demolition would therefore cause irreparable harm, contrary to the specific requirements of the NPPF.

The design and appearance of the proposal is acceptable and supported by the Quality Review Panel.

Noted, but our understanding is that this refers to elevations only and no reference was made to the bulk and massing.

The development would not have a material adverse impact on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. The neighbours disagree with this statement as shown by the number of objections and the petition containing over 800 names. It will create a solid wall of 5-6 storey bulky blocks of flats running from number 64 to 74 Shepherds Hill.

In addition the late submission of the day/sunlighting report by Rights of Light Consulting on 9th November 2017 is very superficial and fails to address adequately the loss of sunlight. The street elevation of Altior Court is likely to lose a considerable amount of afternoon/evening sun, being overshadowed by the 5 story elevation, some 4-5 metres in front of it. To the rear a similar problem will arise for the residents of Dale Lodge, where the garden elevation will lose morning sun. In addition, daylighting and outlook, particularly on the side elevations of the adjoining buildings, will be severely curtailed, detracting from their amenity.

There would be no significant impact on parking.
These are luxury flats and it is unlikely that the owners will not have at least one car. The scheme is resulting in the loss of two on street parking spaces available to anyone in the area. Whilst 10 spaces are provided on site, this leaves, counting the loss of the two on street spaces, a shortfall of 8 spaces.

Under the Heads of Terms in the committee report, section 5 refers to on street parking being "restricted". This does not indicate whether the building will be car free or not and how many on street permits will be allowed.

The overall benefits of the proposal would outweigh any 'harm' to the conservation area.
The Society strongly disputes this statement. Under the NPPF, the harm that will be caused to the Conservation Area by the removal of this building, is not outweighed by any benefit. The creation of 16 luxury flats for which there is arguably inadequate demand and which make insufficient contribution to affordable housing does not constitute a benefit.

Although the viability report provided evidence to illustrate that the proposed development would not be viable the applicant has provided £300,000 contribution towards affordable housing provision in the Borough.
For 10 additional units, under the London Plan, 50% affordable housing would be expected to be provided, which is 5 units. A contribution of £300,000 will not provide this. It therefore clear, and regrettable, that the viability statement has been taken at its face value without being independently verified.

The proposed development is in accordance with the development plan.
Our comments clearly show that this is an excessively generalised statement which does not make any effort to specify what parts of the development plan it is actually in accordance with,

In view of all the above, the Highgate Society urges that Haringey's Planning Committee refuse this strongly-opposed and inappropriate scheme, which will result in the loss of one of the few remaining Victorian buildings in Shepherd's Hill and considerable harm to the conservation area.

Elspeth Clements
Chair Highgate Society Planning Committee
12th November 2017

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 7

Reference No: HGY/2017/2185	**Ward:** Alexandra
Address: Land Rear of Yewtree Close **Proposal:** Erection of 4 detached houses with basements and provision of off-street parking.	

ADDITIONALTHIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

4 additional submissions have been received as outlined/ summarised below:

GROSVENOR ESTATE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (GERA): BRIEFING FOR MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

The appended submission poses nine questions which we believe Planning Sub-Committee members should seek satisfactory answers to before deciding whether Planning Application HGY/2017/2185 should be granted planning permission. These questions are:

Key Question 1: *Are Haringey Officers willing to take the steps necessary to confirm that a 1 l/sec discharge rate is suitable for the proposed development site?*

Key Question 2: *Why have Haringey Planning Officers ignored the evidence submitted by the owners of 2 Yewtree Close showing that the developers' site access proposals clearly encroach on their land, while accepting the developer's 'red line' boundary with no evidence to support its validity?*

Key Question 3: *Can Haringey Council legally grant planning permission to an application that includes making use of land not owned by the developer and where the owner of that land has not given the developer permission to make use of it?*

Key Question 4: *Why did Haringey Planning Officers base their assessment of site access safety on a swept path analysis for such a small vehicle?*

Key Question 5*: If vehicles larger than 6.623m x 2.2m attempt to access the site and cannot make use of the land owned by the freeholders of 2 Yewtree Close, will they be able to do this safely? Can we have confidence in judgements as to vehicle and pedestrian safety that do not take possibilities such as this into account?*

Key Question 6: *What guarantees do Planning Officers have with the company providing the small refuse lorries that this service will be available in perpetuity? If there is no guarantee, will this mean that larger lorries will need to access the site in the future?*

Key Question 7: Is it possible to have confidence in the Officers' judgement as to safe site access, when no account is taken of the visibility splay required to demonstrate safe and suitable site access?

Key question 8: *Why have the protestations of numerous local residents and GERA, objecting to the design and overbearing nature of the proposed dwellings, been set aside and judged to be less important than the subjective opinion of a single individual? Should not members of the Planning Sub-Committee make a site visit to reach their own conclusions about the acceptability of application HGY/2-17/2185?*

Key question 9: *Given the potential impact on the lives of so many nearby residents, is it appropriate to base a decision on the loss of amenity largely on the subjective judgement of one individual while overlooking misleading and erroneous 'evidence' incorporated in the developer's planning application? Should not the Planning Sub-Committee insist on making a site visit to see for themselves what is at stake?*

NEIL BENNETT RIBA, ACADEMICIAN, ACADEMY OF URBANISM –ON BEHALF OF GROSVENOR ESTATE RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (GERA)

"There appears to have been no real attempt to decrease the mass of the proposals, while maintaining the number of housing units provided, and they will clearly appear as one mass, in spite of the notional gaps between the blocks. It is also regrettable that the upper floor of the 3 storey houses have not adopted a roof form, rather than a vertical wall, merely set back from that below by 200 mm."

STONE KING LLP – ON BEHALF OF THEIR CLIENTS FREEHOLD/ OWNERS OF 2 YEWTREE CLOSE

They outline that: **"**despite making minor adjustments in the most recently submitted swept path analysis, the Applicant continues to utilise the strip of land in order to create a feasible turning circle. To that end, given that the Applicant is proposing to use land which does not belong to it and over which it has no rights, in order to make access even remotely feasible, the swept path analysis should be discounted from consideration and the committee should decide the Application on the assumption that the only way for the Applicant to exit the site will be to reverse out onto what is a very busy main highway."

OWNERS OF 2 YEWTREE CLOSE

"The developer has provided no evidence whatsoever to validate the legitimacy of the so-called red line boundary."

ADDITIONAL CONDITION:

12. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy should demonstrate surface water run-off generated up to and including a 1 in 100 year event (with allowances for climate change) of no more than 2 l/s unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA and shall be subsequently implemented in accordance with the agreed details prior to first occupation.

Reason: To ensure there is no increased risk of flooding, both on and off-site, in accordance with the NPPF, Policy 5.13 of the London Plan 2016, and Policies DM24, DM25 and DM26 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

This page is intentionally left blank