

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

Monday, 6th December, 2021, 7.00 pm - Tottenham Green Leisure Centre, 1 Philip Lane, Tottenham N15 4JA

Members: Councillors Sarah Williams (Chair), Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Gina Adamou, Dhiren Basu, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Emine Ibrahim, Peter Mitchell, Liz Morris, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, and Yvonne Say.

Quorum: 3

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 16)

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 1 November 2021 and 8 November 2021 as a correct record.

Fiona Rae, Principal Committee Co-ordinator
Tel – 020 8489 3541
Email: fiona.rae@haringey.gov.uk

Fiona Alderman
Head of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)
River Park House, 225 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8HQ

Monday, 06 December 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 2021, 7.00 - 11.30 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim (from item 8), Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Liz Morris, and Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross, and Councillor Yvonne Say.

In attendance: Councillor John Bevan, Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing, and Housing Services.

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. PLANNING PROTOCOL

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gina Adamou. Apologies for lateness were also received from Councillor Emine Ibrahim.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 9, HGY/2021/1771 - The Goods Yard and The Depot, 36 & 44-52 White Hart Lane (and land to the rear) and 867-879 High Road (and land to the rear), Cllr Ibrahim noted that she was an Arsenal supporter and a member of AISA (Arsenal Independent Supporters' Association). She stated that she would take part in the discussion and voting and would be considering the item with an open mind.

6. ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chair proposed that the Committee considered item 10, PPA/2021/0026 Florentia Clothing Village Storage Park, Vale Road, N4 1TD, immediately after item 8, HGY/2021/1604 - 10 Fordington Road, N6 4TJ, before returning to the published agenda order; this was agreed by the Committee. The Chair also stated that she had

agreed a request for objectors to provide additional documentation to accompany their verbal presentations at the meeting. The Chair explained that this related to HGY/2021/1604, 10 Fordington Road, and N6 4TJ and HGY/2021/1771 - The Goods Yard and the Depot, 36 & 44-52 White Hart Lane (and land to the rear), and 867-879 High Road (and land to the rear). There were no objections.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted.

Cllr Rice stated that the documentation provided for this meeting was considerable; it was asked whether the information provided could be more concise. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability responded that officers tried to keep reports succinct but that the Committee report needed to have all of the relevant information; it was added that training on planning issues was also provided to assist members. Cllr Rice suggested that the information provided could be the same length but could be provided in sections over time.

8. HGY/2021/1604 - 10 FORDINGTON ROAD, N6 4TJ

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing garages and shed and erection of dwelling house over three storeys (plus excavation to form a basement level); Erection of rear garden outbuilding; Associated cycle and bin storage; Associated hard and soft landscaping.

Matthew Gunning, Planning Manager, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was confirmed that the proposed building would be built up to the boundary with 12 Fordington Road. Some members of the Committee enquired whether this was acceptable. The Planning Manager acknowledged that this side of the road had some degree of consistency but noted that the area had a varied context. It was stated that the design solution was considered to achieve an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties and the garage and roof pitching would provide some visual separation with a view of trees and greenery in the background.
- In relation to queries about flood risk, the Planning Manager noted that a Basement Impact Assessment had been submitted with the application; this considered flood risk, different types of flooding, and historic watercourses in the area. It was considered that no more investigative works were currently required. It was added that the information submitted provided safeguards but that additional detail would have to be provided as a matter of course as the project advanced.
- In response to a query about basement development, the Planning Manager explained that the normal concern in this instance was the issues potentially caused for adjoining gardens. It was noted that there would be measures to prevent issues and that there was a high degree of permeable surfacing around the site so there would be no adverse effect on the groundwater conditions.

- It was confirmed that the conditions proposed to remove permitted development rights; it was accepted that the proposal would result in a sizeable house and this was proposed to safeguard amenity for residents.

Alex Whittaker spoke in objection to the application. He noted that he did not object to development of the site in principle but that the proposal was not in accordance with council plans and policies. He stated that the run of semi-detached buildings currently had a distinctive and unified character with spacing between properties. It was considered that the proposal would break the character of the road. Alex Whittaker commented that the application would lead to a building that was out of scale and would introduce an unprecedented shared boundary on the street. He added that there would also be windows on the shared boundary and a staircase window which would also be unprecedented. He stated that two storey side extensions were normally set back and were not permitted to have direct boundary windows. It was explained that the neighbouring property would now become a mid-terrace house and it was considered that the design would result in an unfinished appearance on the street, particularly as the other half would never be built. Alex Whittaker stated that this proposal would set a precedent for oversized development in the area and urged the Committee to refuse the application.

David Inwald spoke in objection to the application. He noted that he did not object to development of the site but objected to the design and the impact on neighbouring amenity proposed by the current application. He stated that the application was not in accordance with the policies noted in the report. It was explained that 28 of the 35 responses to the consultation objected to the proposal. He questioned the value of consultation if no weight could be given to the strength of local objection. It was stated that there were objections to the application which related to design, amenity, and flooding impact. It was noted that the form and mass of the proposal would be excessive and unsightly and it would look like a semi detached house which had been cut off. David Inwald commented that the proposal would be overbearing and imposing with a wall that would block the sky; it was noted that the pictures provided could be useful in demonstrating this. It was suggested that the gable end should be redesigned alongside a smaller house and that this would be supported.

In response to the points raised in the objections and subsequent questions, the following responses were provided:

- In relation to the issues raised about policy compliance, the safety of the stairway window, and the compliance with Building Regulations, the Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability stated that Building Regulations were largely separate from planning decisions and that Building Control had raised no objections.
- In response to a question about the proximity of the proposals with the neighbouring property at 12 Fordington Road, Alex Whittaker noted that there were concerns about privacy due to the direct border with the neighbouring property. It was also commented that development above garages was commonly set back on other houses in the street and that the proposals would prejudice future development at 12 Fordington Road. Alex Whittaker noted that he was not professionally qualified but also believed that Building Regulations B4 11.11 provided that unprotected areas on boundaries, such as windows, were no more

than 1sqm and a maximum of 4% of the area; he noted that the staircase window clearly appeared to exceed this.

- It was enquired whether there would normally be this number of windows on a boundary wall and whether this was considered to be acceptable. The Planning Manager explained that design solutions could typically be achieved in relation to Building Regulations. He stated that, to protect privacy, a condition was proposed requiring all windows over 1.7 metres high to be fixed shut. Trespass from a window opening was resolved through party wall agreements and, although not ideal, this was a fairly common arrangement. It was added that officers considered the arrangements to be acceptable overall.
- It was confirmed that the proposed conditions required all windows over 1.7 metres high to be obscured glass and fixed shut.
- The objectors confirmed that one of the major issues that residents had with the proposals was the design of the house which looked as if it had been cut in half. It was considered to look unsightly and out of keeping in the area.

John Attree and Paula Attree, applicants, stated that they had lived on the site for 43 years and wanted to remain. John Attree stated that he was sympathetic to objectors and that there was a difference of opinion in relation to the aesthetic. It was noted that the applicants were comfortable with the appearance of the house in the streetscape and believed that there would be no structural damage to or risk of flooding for neighbouring properties. He explained that he had met with the Director of Development approximately one year ago for a pre-application meeting. At this meeting, he commented that the applicants had been given clear guidance on how to make the application more acceptable and that the report covered all major issues relating to design and the objections raised.

In relation to the proposal to build up to the boundary of 12 Fordington Road, John Attree stated that a garage from 1922 had been built at 10 Fordington Road; it was intended to follow this building line and the applicants had received guidance at their pre-application meeting that this was acceptable. He added that this had been built before the garage at 12 Fordington Road and that this had not followed its planning permission and abutted directly on to the neighbouring garage of 10 Fordington Road. John Attree also commented that there were at least 10 pairs of houses on the road which had less of a gap than was proposed in this application. It was noted that there was a lot of variation in the area and the applicants did not believe that the proposal would be out of keeping.

It was noted that the side windows would be obscured and fire rated. It was stated that, in Fordington Road, there were a number of double storey windows and houses with stairwells on the side of the site. John Attree stated that all of the other, major points of design from the pre-application meeting had been followed by the applicants.

In relation to the proposed basement, it was noted that the applicants had a basement consultant, Morwena Corrie, and that a Basement Impact Assessment had been submitted following the pre-application meeting. It was explained that intrusive works would be carried out which would include a ground movement assessment. It was added that the site currently had puddling but that this dissipated without intervention; it was suggested that, as a result of the proposal, the formal drainage routine would improve the site.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Some members of the Committee acknowledged that opinions differed over the aesthetics of the proposal and enquired why the design would create the appearance of half a house. The applicant team stated that they had been advised that a gable end would make an ideal end to the run of houses. It was noted that there were at least eight other gabled ends in the area. It was added that, given the variety of styles in the area and the pre-application guidance provided by the council, the design was considered to be reasonable.
- The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the proposal was considered to be the best solution as the hipped roof mirrored the site to the north east and the profile matched the rest of the terrace. It was considered that the gable end was relatively harmless to the neighbouring properties, which were reasonably distant and well screened, and there would be a minimal impact on daylight, sunlight, and neighbouring gardens. It was added that the proposal was a visually interesting gable, was considered to have an interesting design, and that there were a range of existing styles in the area.

Following a vote with 7 votes for and 2 votes against, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Cllr Ibrahim did not take part in the voting for this item as she was not present for the full item.

9. HGY/2021/1771 - THE GOODS YARD AND THE DEPOT, 36 & 44-52 WHITE HART LANE (AND LAND TO THE REAR), AND 867-879 HIGH ROAD (AND LAND TO THE REAR)

The Committee considered an application for full planning application for (i) the demolition of existing buildings and structures, site clearance and the redevelopment of the site for a residential-led, mixed-use development comprising residential units (C3); flexible commercial, business, community, retail and service uses (Class E); hard and soft landscaping; associated parking; and associated works. (ii) Change of use of No. 52 White Hart Lane from residential (C3) to a flexible retail (Class E) (iii) Change of use of No. 867-869 High Road to residential (C3) use.

At 8.30pm, the Committee had a brief adjournment to rectify some technical issues for those joining and watching the meeting remotely. The meeting resumed at 8.35pm.

The Planning Officer highlighted that one late comment had been received from the London Borough of Waltham Forest which was supportive of the current layout but asked that a construction logistics plan be reserved by condition.

Graham Harrington, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

Questions relating to the masterplan, design heritage and tall buildings, housing, and social and public realm infrastructure.

- In response to a question about how the proposal fit within the masterplan, the Head of Development Management noted that the principle of this piecemeal approach, where parts of the masterplan were built out, had been established in the extant consents. It was stated that this application sought to continue this and to evolve the masterplan. It was commented that an application for the entire site allocation had been recently submitted but it was highlighted that this was not the issue before the Committee at present.
- Some members of the Committee noted that the masterplan said that indicative heights should be 10-18 storeys. The Head of Development Management explained that, as established by previous planning permissions, heights had increased. It was noted that there had been natural progression over time and that, due to the housing numbers, density had increased. The Planning Officer noted that the report acknowledged this and tried to assess the application against the masterplan, planning permission that had been granted, and the tall buildings policy.
- It was clarified that there had been another application from Lendlease for the same area and the Planning Officer explained that it was not uncommon to have multiple applications on land. It was noted that the applicant for this application owned the land and was seeking permission for an enhanced scheme with additional homes; it was commented that this could be complex but that this was permitted under the planning system.
- In relation to the extant planning permissions for the site, it was noted that there was existing planning permission for two other schemes which could be implemented. The Planning Officer explained that there could be benefits and disadvantages to a new scheme and this was summarised in the report.
- It was noted that the Deputy Mayor of London had stated that the application did not fully comply with the London Plan. The Planning Officer explained that all Stage 1 reports set out why applications were not fully compliant and explained the relevant issues. It was noted that officers then sought to address these issues before the application was re-considered at Stage 2; this was a typical process.
- It was enquired whether the Quality Review Panel (QRP) was supportive of the final scheme. The Planning Officer noted that the final scheme had not been sent back to the QRP but that some of the proposed revisions in the application were in direct response to comments made by the QRP. It was added that pages 109-115 of the agenda pack set out the QRP comments and the changes to the application were listed.

- Some members of the Committee stated that, under the masterplan, the tall buildings should use River Apartments as a reference point and descended in height moving south, which was not the case in the proposal. It was enquired why officers were now comfortable with this. The Planning Officer explained that the masterplan had established the principle of taller buildings on the western edge, generally descending into White Hart Lane. It was noted that the buildings generally did this. It was acknowledged that the tower was now taller but that it was also further away from White Hart Lane. Although this did not sit wholly within the masterplan, there was an underlying approach to reduce heights down to White Hart Lane. It was stated that Block A would break the principle of River Apartments being the tallest building but there was planning permission in place for the Depot and officers considered that the proposed undulation was an acceptable evolution of principle.

Questions relating to design

- Some members noted that it was incredibly challenging to compare the differences in schemes and to consider the masterplan but also not to consider the masterplan. It was stated that that the Design Officer comments on page 80 of the agenda pack noted an improvement in the detailed design but that the QRP comments on page 108 noted a lack of support, mainly due to the scale of the building and the designs. It was acknowledged that design was subjective but it was enquired why these comments were so at odds.
- The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that there had been a significant number of changes to the detailed design of the towers since they were last considered by the QRP, in recognition of the significant concerns raised. It was noted that the Design Officer and the QRP were happy with the lower rise elements of the scheme and that there had been significant improvements in relation to the towers, including the introduction of a shadow gap, a change to cladding colours to be more consistent, and a simplified design to work better with longer views. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that a key consideration was the amendments made and whether these were considered to resolve the issues raised by the QRP.
- In relation to the design of tall buildings and their impact on heritage assets, it was noted that the comments from the specialist officer in the report stated that the towers would have a seriously negative impact on the wider setting of The Grange Listed Building (Grade II) which would outweigh the positive benefits of the improvement of the immediate setting. The Head of Development Management noted that the tower was considered to have a negative impact and the low rise buildings were considered to have a positive impact and, weighing these together, it was considered that there was less than substantial harm. The Principal Conservation Officer explained that all components of the development were considered in the assessment. It was noted that the proposal included some positive action which would enhance the heritage aspect and that towers were much more prominent but that harm could be considered on a spectrum.
- In relation to daylight and sunlight, the report stated that there would be minor effects compared to the previously agreed development but the Committee noted that the table on page 169 of the agenda pack, which provided a comparison, showed that almost all cases would have a negative impact.

- It was confirmed that all homes would be tenure blind and that, although there would only be four Low Cost Rent homes in Block A, these would be in duplex maisonettes with individual front doors. It was explained that there was often specific, separate lift access for Low Cost Rent homes for maintenance reasons as this helped to keep service charges low. However, it was highlighted that there would be no external differences between different types of housing.
- Some concerns were raised in relation to the reduced gaps between the tower blocks. The Planning Officer explained that the repositioning of the towers was aimed to even out the spacing and to better align the towers with the east to west routes through the wider site. It was added that the southern tower on the Goods Yard was also further from The Grange to balance the impact of the towers.
- It was acknowledged that nearly 50% of the proposed flats would be single aspect and that this was reasonably common with higher density developments. It was considered that the overall daylight and sunlight would be high quality. It was added that the single aspect homes were generally larger to compensate for the single aspect.
- Some members queried how there could be major beneficial impacts in relation to views of the development, specifically the towers. The Planning Officer noted that the applicant had provided an assessment of the viewpoints. It was noted that officers generally agreed with this assessment but that, in some cases, disagreed with the degree of benefit suggested; this was demonstrated in the report.
- It was noted that Embankment Lane would be 5 metres wide at one end and 3.7 metres wide at the other end. Assurance was provided that waste servicing would take place from the wider section of the road.

The Chair noted that it was approaching 10pm but that, under the provisions of the constitution, the Committee could continue on the item at hand at the Chair's discretion. She stated that the discussion of the item would continue and would conclude as soon as possible.

- In relation to daylight and sunlight, some members noted that only 59% of the main living rooms with a southerly aspect satisfied the BRE guidelines and that there was some notable impact, which included the school. The Planning Officer noted that all levels of planning policy, including the London Plan, required the BRE guidelines to be interpreted flexibly as it was not necessarily designed for the London context. It was commented that most homes with retained levels of Visible Sky Component in the mid-teens were seen to be acceptable. It was highlighted that, based on local comments, the application retained the boundary wall and that this did have an impact on the school but schools were less sensitive than homes for daylight and sunlight impact. It was added that Block E was similar to what was previously approved in outline; it would have a similar scale and impact and this was considered to be acceptable.
- The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability, stated that design was subjective but that decisions should be made in accordance with development plan policies. The report assessed the application in light of the relevant policies which were a good framework for assessment.

Any other questions

- In relation to the space to be used by the school and for wider use, it was enquired whether it was suitable for a school to share its playground to be public realm. The Planning Officer explained that this was the same proposal that was approved as part of the previous Depot planning permission and it was highlighted that the area would not be open to the public whilst in use by the school. This issue had been discussed previously and it was recommended to include the same condition that had been agreed by the Committee, namely that there would be a management plan which would also be approved by the school.
- Some concerns were expressed that the proposal would prevent the possible building of a pedestrian/ cycle bridge from east to west over the railway line that had been previously identified. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant was proposing a different, although slightly less straight, route for a possible bridge. It was added that this was not a specific proposal in the masterplan and would still require agreement from the landowner and Network Rail.
- It was noted that the council would have first refusal on 77 homes with 16 at London Affordable Rent but it was enquired whether the council would be able to determine these rent levels. The Head of Development Management explained that the council would be given these units at London Affordable Rent values but that it would be the council's choice how to use and populate the units.
- It was enquired whether the Goods Yard comprised industrial land and whether it should provide 50% affordable units. The Planning Officer stated that the designation of the land had been assessed and it had been concluded that the site was not industrial land. It was added that, under London Plan policy, there was not a requirement to provide 50% affordable units but that any application on industrial land which did so could be taken under the fast track approach; this amounted to 35% for non-industrial land.
- In relation to water supply to residential units, concerns were expressed that the anticipated water usage per resident seemed very low and Thames Water had noted some issues. The Planning Officer explained that the stated usage was a stretching target but that it would be aimed to meet this through the efficiency of appliances within the units. It was added that it was not unusual for Thames Water to raise issues with a large application and it was noted that there was a proposed condition which dealt with this.
- Some members queried the calculation of publicly accessible land and suggested that over 29,000sqm would be required; it was considered that neighbourhood streets and lanes should not be included in the calculation of open space. The Planning Officer noted that a spaces were listed on page 124 of the agenda pack and it was stated that, under the applicant's calculations, there would be a total of 4,473sqm, or 8,870sqm including public realm areas. It was explained that this had been assessed and did not meet the policy for publicly accessible open space but it was noted that this was not uncommon. It was added that the policy aimed to maximise spaces and that officers worked to ensure as much space as possible was offered. It was commented that the report provided this information so that members could make a judgement on acceptability.
- It was enquired why it was proposed to charge the Haringey CIL rate at the time permission was granted and whether this would reduce the amount of CIL payable in this instance. The Planning Officer explained that the existing Depot planning permission had included a similar proposal to recognise that an increase in CIL

would make the planned affordable housing offer difficult to deliver. It was therefore proposed to accept that the affordable housing offer was based on current CIL levels in order to deliver the benefits of a large scheme.

- Regarding density, it was noted that all levels of planning policy now encouraged a design-led approach rather than a particular density matrix calculation. It was acknowledged that the report referenced a density of 350 units per hectare which was considered to be a higher density and indicated that a higher level of scrutiny was required. It was noted that the public space and social infrastructure proposals had been assessed with a higher density scheme in mind.
- It was noted that 83% of the dwellings would be 1 and 2 bed units and it was enquired whether this was an overconcentration, particularly in the context of the area. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the current proposal included a slightly improved dwelling mix and it was accepted that approximately 17% family sized homes was a reasonable mix.
- It was clarified that the proposal offered 36% affordable housing and that, under the London Plan fast track approach, it was not open to a viability assessment.
- Some members commented that, in relation to the scale of the proposal, they were not satisfied that there was any justification for the proposed increases in height. It was commented that Block A would be increased to 32 storeys, Block B would be 27 storeys, and there would no longer be a stepping down of building heights. It was enquired how this was considered to be acceptable. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the design had changed and the layout had improved. It was explained that the new proposal would move the main street so that it would have two active frontages instead of running alongside the railway. It was considered that the impact on neighbours would be broadly the same as the previously approved scheme, that the design of the towers would be coherent and would respond to River Apartments, and that there would be improvements in the near and long distance views. It was suggested that the current scheme had significant design improvements, including better layout and networks.
- Some members noted that they would have like to have seen a more future proof approach to waste, such as waste separation at source.
- In relation to the first right to purchase 77 of the 101 Low Cost Rent homes; it was enquired who would be offered the remaining Low Cost Rent homes and whether the council could be offered all of them. The Planning Officer noted that a registered provider had not been identified yet and would be confirmed later on. It was explained that site allocation NT5 asked schemes in the area to make a proportionate contribution to estate renewal and it was not possible to require all Low Cost Rent homes to be offered to the council but that the remaining homes could be purchased by the council at market rate.

John Simon spoke in objection to the application. He noted that he lived in River Apartments, where there were about 220 homes and school. He strongly supported the redevelopment of area but had concerns about due diligence in this extensive and complex scheme and it was considered that the proposals were acceptable rather than good. He commented that there was incomplete investigation, including the noise from trains, wind conditions, and general subsidence for the new basement works. John Simon expressed concerns about the risk of quality degradation and health and safety issues, including cladding, and suggested that a risk averse approach should be taken. He stated that there had been no wind tunnel censor measurements and that the proposals would degrade the balconies in River Apartments so that they

would become unusable and potentially unsafe. He added that, under London Policy 7.7, all buildings needed to consider environmental factors and ensure that residents were not put at a disadvantage. He commented that the closer proximity of the high rise building created conditions that were more concerning for wind tunnelling. It was noted that the data had not been measured but there was a suggestion to avoid using public areas to ensure safety which was unacceptable for residents. It was stated that five sensors in public areas had been flagged as unsafe, compared with one area in the consented scheme. It was also noted that residents would have to deal with additional train vibrations compared to the vibration assessment that was undertaken in 2017, particularly as a 50% heavier train stock was now used on the nearby line.

Georgina Sapsted spoke in objection to the application. She stated that there was a masterplan and this should be followed. She noted that the report suggested that the masterplan was being followed but that this was not the case. It was commented that the high rise building would now be 40% closer and that the proposal conflicted with the masterplan vision that taller buildings should fall towards the edge of the development. It was stated that River Apartments would now be the shortest tower in the area. Georgina Sapsted commented that the consented scheme was just within an acceptable range but that the current proposals were unacceptable. She believed that River Apartments was not sufficiently shown in the images provided and that the proposals would not have a good design relationship. It was considered that the density of the proposals would be too high. Georgina Sapsted also stated that she was not convinced that Cllr Peacock did not have any conflict of interest in relation to this proposal.

In response to the points raised in the objections and subsequent questions, the following responses were provided:

- It was enquired whether a deviation from the masterplan was a material planning consideration. The Head of Development Management noted that the policy for this was set out on page 97 of the agenda pack. It was explained that where a development formed part of an allocated site, the Council would require a masterplan to demonstrate that the proposal would not prejudice future development on the site, adjoining land, or frustrate the delivery of the site allocation or wider area outcomes. It was added that the policy did not rigidly enforce masterplans and that there was a lot of discretion. It was highlighted that the development should accord with the principles set out in the most recent masterplan.
- The Chair confirmed that Cllr Peacock had not made any declarations of interest.

Richard Serra, applicant team, stated that the applicant had a proven track record of delivering high quality developments and wanted to deliver an inclusive neighbourhood. It was commented that the scheme would provide approximately 900 new homes, including 296 affordable homes which was an increase from the consented scheme. He explained that the proposal would include the designs for the two sites together, would provide better environmental proposals, as well as green spaces, a new public park, and dedicated cycle routes. Richard Serra noted that he was proud that the development would be net zero carbon and would have high performing building fabrics and renewable materials. It was added that there would be substantial place provision for all homes and that the development had the potential to provide hundreds of jobs.

Richard Serra stated that the applicant had engaged with the local community and officers and that a number of changes had been made in response to points raised. It was commented that the heights of buildings had been reduced, from 100 metres to 88 metres in part, which was shorter than the approved scheme. He stated that the proposal had been carefully assessed and it was considered that the overall impacts were acceptable and in accordance with policy. It was added that an independent consultant was involved in undertaking a wind assessment and that this issue was being taken seriously. It was added that the proposals were supported by the Mayor of London and that there had been no objection from Historic England.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Some members of the Committee acknowledged that the applicants had referred to the green credentials of the proposal but noted that, as set out on page 187 of the agenda pack, the fabric efficiencies did not meet the minimum London Plan standard of 10% and the proposed green savings were below Local Plan Strategic Policy SP4. The applicant team explained that carbon emissions could be calculated using SAP10, which they stated more accurately reflected the direction of travel and was supported by London Plan, or using SAP2012, which was more historic. Under SAP2012, it was noted that the proposals fell just short of the 10% requirement but that this rose to 11% under SAP10. It was explained that this was because of how carbon was assigned to electricity production. It was acknowledged that the Sustainability Officer had used SAP2012 but had referred to SAP10 when calculating the carbon offset payment.
- Some members of the Committee noted that Local Plan Strategic Policy SP4 aimed for 20% green savings, rather than 10%. The Planning Officer explained that the council policy pushed developers to go as far as possible and had sought to apply SAP2012. It was noted that the assessment had been rigorous and, in the context of the London Plan and the overall hierarchy, there was a good amount of savings from renewables in the overall figure for the proposal. It was noted that the carbon reductions overall were considered to be good and, with offsetting, the application met the carbon zero requirements.
- It was enquired why the applicant had requested a five year time limit to start development, rather than the standard three year period. Richard Serra noted that it was aimed to start construction in June 2022. It was explained that the five year period recognised the existing tenants and lease on the site and would be consistent with the previous consent. The Planning Officer added that this was a very large scheme and would include lease negotiations and other matters. It was also noted that previous consents had been given more than three years and that additional time would be beneficial in determining how the development would fit in with plans for the wider area.
- In relation to shared ownership homes, it was noted that the maximum annual income of £90,000 was quite high and it was queried whether this could be more specific; for example, whether this would be reserved for local people and/ or at a lower level initially. The Planning Officer clarified that the proposal was to require a marketing plan and that there would be a protected time period for those on lower incomes to secure shared ownership first. It was added that the figure of £90,000 was set by the Mayor of London.
- It was clarified that the matters relating to the existing tenant only applied to the Depot. Some members of the Committee acknowledged that there was an existing

tenant on part of the site but enquired whether development of the Goods Yard could be started sooner. Richard Serra informed the Committee that the Goods Yard was currently being used temporarily to facilitate some events. He explained that, if the scheme was approved, some time would be required to procure a developer and it was likely that there would need to be co-ordination of the Goods Yard and the Depot due to the size and relationship of the schemes. It was added that the applicant would try to ensure delivery as soon as possible.

- Some members noted that this was the second application for the site and enquired whether there would be additional applications in the future. Richard Serra explained that the current application tried to bring the scheme up to date, meet more housing need, and provide better environmental arrangements. He believed it was the best scheme that could be achieved and highlighted that there would be no attempt to increase the height of the proposals.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison proposed a motion to refuse the application on the grounds of height and density, design of the tall buildings, the impact on heritage assets, the visual impact on the long and medium range views, and the fact that the three tall towers were not considered to be sympathetic to the lower and medium rise buildings directly adjacent from a design perspective. This was seconded by Cllr Morris.

Cllr Mitchell enquired whether Cllr Cawley-Harrison would consider an additional reason for refusal, namely the amount of publicly accessible open space. He noted that he also wanted to include reference to the distance between tower blocks within the point raised about the height and density of the proposals. Cllr Cawley-Harrison stated that he was happy to include the amount of publicly accessible open space, particularly in reference to the density of the proposal, and to include the proximity of the blocks within his proposal. Cllr Morris confirmed that she was happy with the proposed additional reasons.

The Head of Development Management drew the Committee's attention to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 2.6 of the report, which was required to be considered if the Committee was minded to decide against the officer recommendation. It was noted that the council was below its housing delivery target and, therefore, this requirement under paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) applied. It was stated that the Committee must consider, when assessing the impact on protected area such as conservation area, whether there were any clear policy reasons that justified refusal. If this was not the case, as set out in officer recommendation, the Committee would have to consider whether the adverse impacts of development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when looking at the framework as a whole. It was highlighted that the benefits were set out on page 165 of the agenda pack and this should be considered when weighing the harm of the issues raised with the benefits of the proposal.

Cllr Mitchell noted that the addendum also referred to the housing delivery test and concluded that the development was found to be in accordance with development plan policies and therefore consideration of paragraph 11d of the NPPF was not required in this instance. He stated that the proposal was not in accordance with the High Road West masterplan framework in respect of tall buildings. The Head of Development Management noted that the masterplan is not policy but was guidance.

It was added that the policy was DM55 and AAP1, as outlined in detail earlier, which required the development not to prejudice future parcels of land. The site allocation stated that proposals must be in line with the principles but absolute compliance was not required.

Cllr Say noted that non-adherence to the masterplan was a material consideration. The Head of Development Management clarified that non-compliance with the principles, if found to be the case, was a material planning consideration. It was acknowledged that the Committee could reach a different conclusion from the officer report if the issues were considered and weighed, it was found that the proposal was in breach of some of those principles, and it was not considered that this was outweighed by the benefits.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison stated that, in response to the points raised by the Head of Development Management, he would like to proceed with his motion and include reference to specific policies. He believed that the following policies were engaged: London Plan Policy D3 and D9 and Haringey Local Plan Policy H1, D3, D9, DM6, and NT5. Cllr Cawley-Harrison stated that he was not sure about the specific policy which would apply in relation to the space considerations raised by Cllr Mitchell. The Head of Development Management noted that London Plan Policy D3 would likely cover this issue.

Following a vote with 6 votes in favour and 4 votes against, it was

RESOLVED

To REFUSE planning permission on the grounds of height and density, including the distance between the tower blocks, design of the tall buildings, the impact on heritage assets, the visual impact on the long and medium range views, the fact that the three tall towers were not considered to be sympathetic to the lower and medium rise buildings directly adjacent from a design perspective, the amount of publicly accessible open space.

In making this decision, the Committee considered that the following policies were engaged: London Plan Policy D3 and D9 and Haringey Local Plan Policy H1, D3, D9, DM6, and NT5.

In accordance with the decision of the Planning Sub-Committee, the following reasons for refusal were submitted in a draft decision notice to the Greater London Authority (GLA):

Tall Buildings

The proposed tall buildings (Goods Yard Blocks A and B and Depot Block A), by virtue of their height, breadth, proximity to each other and to the existing River Apartments tall building, and by virtue of their architectural expression and design, would: (i) have an unacceptable adverse effect on long, mid-range and immediate views from the surrounding area, including the wider setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets; (ii) maximise rather than optimise residential density; and (iii) fail to be of a sufficiently high architectural quality expected of such prominent buildings. As such,

the proposed development would be contrary to the Paragraphs 130 and 134 of the NPPF (July 2021), London Plan Policies GG2, D3, D9 and HC1, Local Plan Strategic Policies SP1, SP11 and SP12, North Tottenham AAP Policies AAP5, AAP6 and Site Allocation NT5, Local Plan Policies DM6 and DM9 and guidance in the adopted High Road West Masterplan Framework (September 2014).

Heritage

The proposed tall buildings (Goods Yard Blocks A and B and Depot Block A), by virtue of their, height, breadth and architectural expression, would cause less than substantial harm to the significance and setting of designated and undesignated heritage assets in the surrounding area that is not outweighed by the likely public benefits that would be delivered. As such, there would be a clear reason to refuse the proposals pursuant to Paragraph 11(d)(i) of the NPPF (July 2021) and the proposed development would be contrary to the Paragraph 202 of the NPPF (July 2021), London Plan Policy, Local Plan Strategic Policies SP11 and SP12, North Tottenham AAP Policies AAP5, AAP6 and Site Allocation NT5, Local Plan Policies DM6 and DM9 and guidance in the adopted High Road West Masterplan Framework (September 2014).

Open Space

The proposed development includes an insufficient provision of publicly accessible open space for the estimated resident population and as such fails to optimise site capacity through the design-led approach. This under provision is contrary to Paragraphs 7, 93 and 98 of the NPPF (July 2021), London Plan Policies GG2 and D3, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP13, North Tottenham AAP Policies AAP5, AAP6 and Site Allocation NT5, Local Plan Policies DM12 and DM20 and guidance in the adopted High Road West Masterplan Framework (September 2014).

10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The Chair referred to the note on pre-application briefings and this information was noted.

11. PPA/2021/0026 - FLORENTIA CLOTHING VILLAGE STORAGE PARK, VALE ROAD, N4 1TD

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the provision for five new blocks of light industrial floor space (GEA equates to circa 9,880sqm).

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Committee commented that the site was commonly referred to as a village, rather than a campus, and was a tribute to the wife of a local Greek Cypriot resident. Tom Horne, DP9 (Planning Agent), acknowledged the concept of the site as a village. He explained that there was a contractual commitment to retain the name and that it was aimed to invest and expand in the ethos and spirit of the existing site.

- Some members of the Committee expressed disappointment in the designs which resembled warehouses converted into workshops with corrugated roofs. They had no objection to the surface treatment and spaces but stated that the shape looked like a Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) depot. It was acknowledged that design was subjective but it was suggested that the site provided an opportunity to create something interesting and modern.
- The applicant team set out the process for the proposed design. It was explained that, following discussions with existing occupiers and consideration of the existing buildings, the application aimed to build on the current offer and respond to what was needed locally. It was noted that there would be green and pedestrian spaces as well as working spaces. It was stated that the buildings on the site did not have an overall design but had emerged over a number of years; the proposals would try to pull the buildings together, alongside additional planting and colour. It was added that the buildings would be modernised and this would include better insulation. It was commented that the design of the proposal would aim to reflect the wider, Haringey warehouse district. It was also noted that there was a need for this type of space in the area.
- In relation to scale and massing, it was noted that the existing village was between two and four storeys and that the proposals were largely 3 storeys. It was acknowledged that the majority of the images provided focused on the new buildings and it might be useful to provide more detail about the views and connections between the existing and new buildings.
- Some members of the Committee asked the applicant team to ensure that the proposals recognised and honoured the historic connection of the site with the Cypriot community and the rag trade. The applicant team noted that they agreed with this and added that sites of this nature worked best when the occupiers supported the site and encouraged others to work there as well.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

At 8.25pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment. The meeting recommenced at item 6, Planning Applications, at 8.30pm.

12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 6 December 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date