

Felicity Foley, Acting  
Committees Manager

020 8489 2919

felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

08 November 2019

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Monday, 11th November, 2019

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:

- 6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 6)**
  
- 8. HGY/2019/1183 - 1-6 CRESCENT MEWS N22 7GG (PAGES 7 - 16)**

Yours sincerely

Felicity Foley, Acting Committees Manager

This page is intentionally left blank

## **MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 7TH OCTOBER, 2019, 7.00 - 9.58 PM**

### **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Preston Tabois, Sarah Williams and Liz Morris**

### **360. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Noted.

### **361. PLANNING PROTOCOL**

Noted.

### **362. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adamou and Hinchcliffe.

Councillor Morris was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Hinchcliffe.

### **363. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **364. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **365. MINUTES**

Members commented that some of the conditions raised as part of the discussion were not included in the minutes of the last meeting. Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, advised that all conditions and informatives had been noted by officers and would be included in the decision notice.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9 September 2019 be approved.**

### **366. HGY/2019/1775 - LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS**

The Committee considered an application for approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, access, pertaining to Buildings D3 and D4, forming Phase 2 of the Eastern Quarter, including the construction of 101 residential

units and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning permission HGY/2017/3117 dated 19th April 2018.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers and the applicant responded to questions from the Committee:

The applicant team had worked with the Council's Carbon Management Team, ventilation experts and noise consultants to assess the impact of the energy centre on residents and the public. All emissions would exit the building via a flue at the roof level, and not out of the ground floor. There was a condition which required that the noise level would not exceed 10dB of the background noise, and this would be monitored by a noise kit. There would be some heat from the ground level – 40 degrees, at 4mph – but this would be in areas with planting so that people could not walk closely to the vents, and would not be underneath any balconies. Around a third of the vents would emit warm air, a third would take in cold air, and a third would be doors – therefore it could be controlled where the warm air vents would be situated.

- The plan was for the Council to take on the lease for the energy centre, and to deliver affordable energy to homes in the borough. It was expected that 5000 new homes would be coming forward in future years, and the energy centre would be able to supply the energy for all of these. It was envisaged that the energy centre would be supplying energy within the next 15 years.
- There were a number of safeguards on the roof space – a 1.2m brick parapet at the edge of the roof top, with a 20cm metal balustrade. There was also a further 1m high fence around the inner communal area.
- There was no difference in design for the energy centre block and other blocks in the development.
- All units were wheelchair accessible, but there were no wheelchair adaptable homes for people to live in the D4 block. Blocks A, B, C were to be built over underground carparks and all had wheelchair adaptable homes.
- The Moselle walkway would be locked at night, and the development of Brook Road would encourage activity in the area. Officers were confident that the area would not become a quiet area to attract anti-social behaviour. There would be an onsite presence to manage the community spaces, the Moselle Walk and the courtyard.
- The ground floor of the block was subject to more detailed design, however due to the energy centre, majority of the frontage would be blank façade or vents.
- Members were reminded that the application was for reserved matters for blocks D3 and D4 and that planning permission had already been approved to include an energy centre in block D4.
- All units in block D4 would be dual aspect. Block D3 had 21 single aspect units. All 3 and 4 bedroom units would have a separate kitchen/diner and living room.
- The development would be car free, with no residents permits available.
- The comments of the QRP in relation to overlooking were made in regard to blocks D1-4, and the design had been revised between the QRP meeting and the reserved matters application for these blocks.

Members discussed the closure of the Moselle Walk during the hours of darkness and considered that this would have a negative impact on the use of the shared spaces / communal areas by cyclists. Officers advised that the Wood Green Area Action Plan would look at cycle connectivity, and that a walking / cycling action plan was being developed. Members also raised concerns that the communal spaces would not be user friendly to both cyclists and pedestrians. Councillor Cawley-Harrison proposed that a condition be added to specify that money should be spent on segregating cycle lanes, and any analysis which did not support the segregation should be considered by Full Council, rather than under officer delegated powers. Robert Walker, the Council's Lawyer, advised that this could not be a condition placed on the developer as it would be for the Council to implement. He advised that an informative could be included for the Planning department to investigate how money could be spent on segregated cycle lanes.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison indicated that he would not be happy with an informative and not a condition. Mr Walker suggested that the Planning Sub-Committee could, separate from determination of the reserved matters application, resolve that:

*"The Planning Department investigates and explores how segregated cycle lanes can be provided within and around the Development using funds from the Walking and Cycling Contribution (to be paid to the Council pursuant to the section 106 agreement dated 19 April 2018) and that a report be brought back to the Sub-Committee on this matter."*

Councillor Bevan moved that a condition be added that segregated cycle lanes be provided on this development. Councillor Williams seconded the motion. Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, advised that as the application was for reserved matters, then the condition would only apply to blocks D3 and D4, and not the whole development.

The Chair moved that the application be granted, with the additional conditions and resolution as discussed, and following a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that:

- i) reserved matters be approved, and the Head of Development Management, or the Assistant Director of Planning be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report, subject to the following addition:

*Condition: That separate cycle lanes be provided on the development.*

*[Clerks note: the wording for any additional conditions and informatives approved by the Committee will be formulated by the Planning Service and included on the decision notice.]*

- ii) The Planning Department is requested to investigate and explore how segregated cycle lanes can be provided within and around the Development using funds from the Walking and Cycling Contribution (to be paid to the Council

pursuant to the section 106 agreement dated 19 April 2018) and that a report be brought back to the Sub-Committee on this matter.

**367. HGY/2019/0938 - 38 CRAWLEY ROAD, N22 6AG**

The Committee considered an application for approval of the demolition of existing buildings and erection of two part-three part-four storey residential blocks and a row of three-storey terraced houses (total of 29 units) and provision of a pedestrian/cycle link connecting Crawley Road to Downhills Way, plus landscaping, cycle and car parking, and other associated works.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers and the applicant responded to questions from the Committee:

- The brick colour was likely to be buff, rather than yellow, which was sympathetic to the local area.
- The intention was to create some form of traffic calming at either end of the development. The space would be narrowed by landscaping and a footpath, and Downhills Way would likely be calmed through public realm work. Landscaping would also be used in front of properties to discourage parking against properties.
- A number of environmental conditions were included on the addendum.
- There would be 67 cycle spaces provided.
- A contribution of £35k would be provided towards landscaping to the east of the site.

The Chair moved that the application be approved, and following a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that:

- i) reserved matters be approved, and the Head of Development Management, or the Assistant Director of Planning be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms as set out in the Committee report.
- ii) That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (i) above is to be completed no later than 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- (iii) That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (i) within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) above, planning permission shall be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions; and

- (iv) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning/Head of Development Management to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-Committee.
- (v) That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (i) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of on-site affordable housing, would fail to provide much needed affordable housing stock within the Borough and would set an undesirable precedent for future similar planning applications. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP2 of the Council's Local Plan 2017 and Policy 3.12 of the London Plan 2016.
  2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan 2017 Policies SP8 and SP9.
  3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations for mitigation measures to promote sustainable transport, by reason of its lack of car parking provision would significantly exacerbate pressure for on-street parking spaces in surrounding streets, prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, SP7 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM32 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
  4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 5.2, 5.3 and 5.7 of the London Plan 2016, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
  5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure works to the public highway and other public realm improvements including the connection through the application site to Downhills Way, would have an unacceptable negative impact the visual amenity of the area and the operation of the public highway, and would fail to meet the requirements of Site Allocation SA60. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM1 and DM33 of the Development Management DPD 2017, Policy 7.5 of the London Plan 2016, and the aims and objectives of SA60 of the Site Allocations DPD.

- (vi) In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (v) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
  - ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
  - iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

**368. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**369. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**370. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**371. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

11 November 2019

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....



**Neighbour representations**

Issue and representations	Officer comment
<b>Principal, land use and housing</b>	
Area will not benefit from the proposed development	<p>The site is vacant and has been unable to be let despite being marketed for several years. The proposed development will greatly improve the state and appearance of the site and mews as well as adding much needed housing stock including social rented units.</p> <p>The principle of the development is assessed in detail at section 6.3 of this report.</p>
There is a lack of social housing and it will not be truly affordable	<p>The level of affordable housing provided (c35% by habitable room) meets London Plan requirements. Furthermore, all AH units will be social rented to which the Council will have first right of refusal should they wish to add them to their own affordable housing stock.</p> <p>Affordable housing matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.4.7 – 6.4.14 of this report.</p>
Provision for social homes however, concerns with the nature, location and entrance to these properties	<p>Council’s Housing Officer is agreeable to family homes in this scheme. This is a mews development and as such, some of the private units and the social units will have entrances and potentially outlooks towards the rear of other buildings. Council’s Housing Officer does not consider that the social units have been specifically picked out and they are in no different a position to many of the private homes. All of the homes also have habitable rooms facing the internal ‘mews’ area and can access/egress through this area.</p> <p>Affordable housing matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.4.7 – 6.4.14 of this report.</p>
Social housing units will have a huge demand on infrastructure	<p>The occupancy levels of social housing compared to market housing aren’t so different as to be considered to materially impact on infrastructure.</p>
The change of use needs to be carefully considered with the loss of a commercial premises	<p>Loss of employment use is assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.3.2 – 6.3.8 of this report.</p>
There is already a lot of housing development taking place in the area	<p>The Council is required to meet housing targets in accordance with national, regional and local planning policies. There is considered to be a housing shortage in London.</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
	Housing provision matters are assessed in detailed at paragraphs 6.3.9 – 6.3.10 of this report.
The development will be good for the area and support local infrastructure	The principle of the development is assessed in detail at section 6.3 of this report.
Poor quality accommodation provided that will also be exacerbated by the adjoining railway	<p>All units met the required Nationally Described Space Standards with all being either dual or triple aspect but one (which is 1 bedroom unit, south facing). The majority of units have private amenity space, access to communal space or both and those that have neither (7) are the smaller units 1 &amp; 2 bedroom, with access to Alexandra Park approximately 400 metres away. In terms of daylight within the proposal, a sample of worst case scenario rooms were measures and the rooms falling short were living rooms that fell only just short. For a higher density development in an urban location, this is considered to be a good outcome. Internal noise levels i.e. mitigating against the adjacent railway land will be appropriately controlled by way of condition as is standard practice.</p> <p>Quality of residential accommodation matters are assessed in detail at section 6.6 of this report.</p>
Provides insufficient amenity space, particularly child playspace	<p>Given the constraints of the site, it has not been possible to meet all of the amenity space requirements within the development. However, as previously noted the majority of the units have private amenity space and there is also communal amenity space and relatively close access (approximately 400m) to a large area of recreational facilities, Alexandra Park. In terms of dedicated child playspace, the on-site provision requirement for under 5 year olds, which is considered key, has been met. In accordance with policy, the remainder can be met though access to local facilities in conjunction with a financial contribution towards their improvement.</p> <p>Amenity space matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.6.5 - 6.6.9 of this report.</p>
<b>Size, Scale and Design</b>	
The development is far too dense and an overdevelopment of the site	The proposed development would be within the London Plan density range for unit numbers but in excess of the guidance range for habitable rooms. However, the higher level of

Issue and representations	Officer comment
	<p>habitable rooms reflects in part the provision (33%) of 3 and 4 bedroom family units, 5 of which, it is important to note, are social rented. This weighs in the development's favour. It is also important to note that the London Plan indicates that it is not appropriate to apply the London Plan Density Matrix and its thresholds mechanistically. Its density ranges for particular types of locations are broad, enabling account to be taken of other factors relevant to optimising potential including local context, design and transport capacity which are particularly important, as well as the availability of social infrastructure.</p> <p>Density matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.5.5 – 6.5.12 of this report.</p>
<p>A gated development is not acceptable</p>	<p>The gate can be partitioned to allow pedestrian access during the day, whilst still managing vehicular access appropriately. It can then be closed at night to maintain security given it is private property.</p> <p>Access matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.8.5 – 6.8.6 of this report.</p>
<p>The architecture is not creative with a poorly designed courtyard and playspace and does not respond or reflect the surrounding area or buildings</p>	<p>The application is challenging, of a difficult, irregular geometry, narrow access through a currently unsightly mews alleyway and constrained by surrounding existing residential properties. However, the proposal is considered to be carefully designed to respond to this and improve the appearance of the site. Of course, architectural aesthetic is subjective.</p> <p>The overall design and appearance of the scheme including the 'courtyard' is assessed in detail at section 6.5 of this report.</p>
Parking, Transport and Highways	
<p>Lack of justification for low level parking and not being appropriate for car free/permit free development will increase parking pressure in an area where traffic congestion is already a concern</p>	<p>The site is in close proximity to Alexandra Palace railway station and two bus routes, the PTAL is predicted by TfL to increase to 4 in 2021 and draft London Plan policy encourages car-free development. Therefore, in this instance, it is considered acceptable to designate the proposed development as 'permit-free'.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be increases in parking demands and pressures as a result of the development, these will be reduced with the proposed mitigation measures and</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
	<p>permit free/car free status and the increase in local parking stresses and not result in demonstrable harm.</p> <p>Car parking matters are assessed in detail a paragraphs 6.8.8 – 6.8.17 of this report.</p>
<p>Access in and out of site is unacceptable particularly for the Fire Brigade, servicing and deliveries</p>	<p>The access to the site is as existing and therefore the owner of the site has a right to use it as is. It is acknowledged that large vehicles will not be able to enter the site, but as noted, this is the existing situation. However, to ensure access and use of the gate, is appropriately managed, a condition requiring a management plan along with a delivery and serving plan is recommended. This will be an improvement over the current arrangements, which allow unrestricted access by commercial vehicles. Furthermore, the number of car parking spaces on site has been reduced from 4 to 3 (blue badge) so that those vehicles that can enter the site can make the turning manoeuvre.</p> <p>Access matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.8.5 – 6.8.6 of this report.</p> <p>Whilst not a planning matter, the London Fire Brigade has been consulted on the application and is satisfied with the proposal and noting Building Regulations Approved Document B B5 for access and facilities for the fire service.</p> <p>Fire safety matters is assessed in detail at section 6.20 of this report.</p>
<p>Concerns with the upgrade, improvement, maintenance and management of the lane noting there is no space for a separate pedestrian path</p>	<p>The application proposes to upgrade the mews and this will be secured by condition requiring final details to be approved. It is noted that the mews is privately owned not Council owned and therefore, general public do not have a legal right to use the mews. However, the trip generation i.e. number of movements generated by the use will be lower than the existing and therefore, less potential for conflict with those pedestrians who may be using the mews. For this reason, a shared surface is considered acceptable in this instance.</p>
<p>Concerns with the transport assessment and methodology submitted</p>	<p>The submitted transport assessment and further supporting information has been prepared in accordance with the relevant professional standards and has been reviewed at several stages by the Council’s Transport Planner. Specifically, the Lambeth methodology is the recognised standard for conducting parking surveys. The full technical specifications and methodologies</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
	<p>are detailed in both the applicant’s submissions as well as Council’s Transport Planner’s comments on the application.</p> <p>Transport matters are assessed in detail at section 6.8 of this report.</p>
<b>Neighbouring residential amenity</b>	
<p>Impact on daylight/sunlight of neighbouring properties, particularly those on Dagmar Road and Crescent Road</p>	<p>The application includes a Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared in accordance with established BRE Guidelines and has been thoroughly reviewed by Council’s Design Officer. The report finds that one neighbouring existing window in residential use would lose a noticeable amount of daylight and that two properties would experience a noticeable loss of sun on the ground to their amenity areas. Overall, the one window and gardens referred to above, whilst weighing against the scheme, do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.</p> <p>Daylight/sunlight matters are assessed in details at paragraphs 6.7.2 – 6.7.8 of this report.</p>
<p>Impact on privacy/overlooking and outlook of neighbouring properties</p>	<p>Windows on upper floors are angled to avoid looking towards existing neighbours, obscured glazed where not serving habitable rooms, high level where other windows also serve habitable rooms or focussed onto the other (north-east and south-east) sides of the proposal where they would look away from neighbours. The result is no clear windows, at eye level, with a direct or reasonably direct view of existing neighbours, in the upper floors of the relevant proposed flats, that is in Blocks B and C, and in the small 1st floor element of one house in Block D. However, there is one first and one second floor window in the north-west facade of the two storey end elevation of Block C that would look towards the back of Dagmar Terrace, albeit approximately 20 metres separation window to window, which is considered acceptable. Two first floor windows in the end elevation of Block D house also face the rear of Dagmar Terrace and whilst separated by only 15 metres, angle pitch of the ground floor sufficiently obscures views so as to make this distance, on balance, acceptable.</p> <p>Privacy and outlook matters are assessed in details at paragraphs 6.7.9 – 6.7.12 of this report.</p>
<p>Noise impacts on surrounding</p>	<p>Given that noise intensive uses have the potential to currently operate from the existing</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
residential properties	<p>commercial uses on site, its redevelopment for entirely residential accommodation is considered to represent an improvement in this regard. The proposed development will also have the positive impact of helping to screen surrounding residential properties from noise emanating from the adjacent Network Rail operations.</p> <p>Noise matters are assessed in detail at paragraph 6.7.13 – 6.7.15 of this report.</p>
<b>Environment and public health</b>	
Construction debris and disturbance	<p>An element of disturbance is expected during construction and the Control of Pollution Act 1974 seeks to limit noisy building works outside 8am to 6pm, Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm Saturday. Furthermore, conditions requiring submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan and Considerate Constructors Scheme registration are recommended to mitigate these potential impacts.</p> <p>Construct impacts are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.7.16 – 6.7.17 and 6.8.21 of this report.</p>
The site is a hazard due to land contamination issues (sealed oil/sludge tanks underground) and more details required.	<p>The proposed development will leave the slab intact, which is a recognised, acceptable method to preventing exposure to contaminated land. Furthermore, Council’s Environmental Health has not objected and has recommended standard conditions for investigation and remediation if found required.</p> <p>Land contamination matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.9. 7- 6.9.10 of this report.</p>
Appropriate refuse management required i.e. what refuse strategy is in place to support the development as well as adjoining commercial uses?	<p>Council’s Waste Management Officer has noted the pulling distances exceed Council’s collector requirements however, does not object to the proposed development. The applicant has agreed to engage private collection arrangements and this will be secured by condition. The applicant cannot be held responsible for the collection arrangement of the adjoining commercial uses.</p> <p>Refuse collection matters are assessed in detail at paragraph 6.8.20 of this report.</p>
The development is not ‘environmentally friendly’ and matters such as trees, landscaping and	<p>The proposed development, given the site constraints, has limited opportunities for soft landscaping. However, when considered against the existing context, the proposed development will be an improvement through the introduction (secured by condition) of</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
ecology/biodiversity particularly given proximity to ecological corridor (Network Rail land) have not been adequately addressed	<p>landscaping that includes planter boxes and features to encourage bat and bird roosting that do not currently exist.</p> <p>Biodiversity and ecology matters are assessed in detail I at paragraphs 6.9.24 – 6.9.28 of this report.</p>
Impact on air quality and carbon management not adequately addressed in submission and development should be seeking to lower emissions noting the 'declaration of a climate emergency'	<p>The application includes an Air Quality assessment that Council's Pollution Officer has no objection subject to a condition requiring an updated version being submitted given consideration to neighbouring sources and a clear statement on number of car parking spaces, which officers note, has reduced from 4 to 3 since these comments.</p> <p>Air quality matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.9.2 – 6.9.6 of this report.</p> <p>An energy report is included with the application and has been assessed by Council's Sustainability Officer who does not object to the proposed development. The schemes proposed using photovoltaic panels and the carbon offset amount will be secured by s106 as is standard procedure and policy compliant</p> <p>Energy and carbon reduction matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.9.17 – 6.9.20 of this report.</p>
Asbestos concerns with the proposed development	<p>Asbestos is not a material planning consideration and is dealt with under separate legislation. However, as per Council's Environmental Health Officer's comments, an informative highlighting that an asbestos survey be carried out prior to demolition is recommended.</p>
Impact proposed development will have on the water table	<p>The proposed development will be built using the existing slab and therefore, not impact on the water table through new foundations etc. Furthermore, the proposed development would result in an improvement in run-off rates compared to the existing situation through the use of storage crates before being released under control. Council's Drainage Engineer has no objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>Flood risk and drainage matters a assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.9.11 – 6.9.16.</p>
Other matters	
Disruption on local infrastructure and utilities	<p>Construction activities are temporary and the potential impacts will be mitigated through standard conditions requiring Construction Management and Logistics Plan as well as</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
	registration with the Considerate Constructors Scheme. Any damage to utilities etc will need to be repaired and the costs met by the applicant.
London Fire Brigade should be consulted on means of escape and fire safety from the cladding propose	As previously noted, the is not a planning matter however, the London Fire Brigade has been consulted on the application and is satisfied with the proposal. This would be considered in detail at Buildings Regs stage.
Security concerns and anti-social behaviour due to poor layout of buildings	<p>The Metropolitan Police has been consulted on the application and also involved in the design of the scheme pre-submission. They do not object to scheme and recommend standard conditions to demonstrate and then achieve Secured by Design accreditation. The mews design will insure that there is overlooking of communal areas and entrances, which is a recognised principle of Secured by Design.</p> <p>Security matters are assessed in detail at paragraphs 6.6.22 – 6.6.24.</p>
Concerns over the feasibility of the retaining the existing wall	This not a planning matter rather one dealt with under Building Regulations.
The flats are for financial gain	This is not a planning matter.
The development is already being marketed on websites	This is not a planning matter.
Impact on businesses reliant on access	This is civil matter / rights of way issue between the owner of the site and the adjoining commercial properties that share access.
Impact of Cross Rail 2 on the site	Crossrail has been consulted and confirms that the application relates to land outside the limits of land subject to consultation by the Crossrail 2 Safeguarding Direction and therefore have no comment on the application.
Network Rail's stipulations for housing developments alongside major railways	Network Rail has been consulted on the application and does not subject to conditions and informatives, which it is recommended be placed on the planning permission should it be granted.



Issue and representations	Officer comment
Public consultation has been inadequate	The application has been consulted upon in accordance with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement and relevant statutory requirements.
There are a number of assessments that are missing i.e. fire, contamination, protected species	All documents considered necessary to validate the application in accordance with the Council’s Validation List were submitted with the application.
The amended plans do not address the concerns that have been raised by residents	For the reasons given in the main body of this report, officers consider that the scheme that has been submitted and subsequently assessed, is acceptable.
The Council’s Design Office should revisit his comments	The design has been assessed by the QRP, Design Officer and Planning Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank