

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

Monday, 24th April, 2023, 7.00 pm - George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8JZ

Members: Councillors Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Nicola Bartlett, John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, Lester Buxton, Luke Cawley-Harrison, George Dunstall, Ajda Ovat, Matt White, and Alexandra Worrell.

Quorum: 3

6. MINUTES (PAGES 1 - 40)

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 29 November 2022 and 5 December 2022 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)
George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Monday, 24 April 2023

This page is intentionally left blank

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 29TH NOVEMBER, 2022, 7.05 - 9.50 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor Cathy Brennan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Yvonne Say, Councillor Matt White, and Councillor Alexandra Worrell.

In attendance: Councillor Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council Housebuilding, Placemaking, and Development; Councillor Julie Davies, Cabinet Member for Communities and Civic Life and Hermitage and Gardens ward; Councillor Tammy Hymas, St Ann's ward; Councillor Mike Hakata; Cabinet Member for Climate Action, Environment, and Transport.

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 John Bevan and Councillor George Dunstall. Councillor Cathy Brennan was in attendance as substitute.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Due to the number of interested parties in attendance, it was agreed to consider Item 8, HGY/2022/1833 - St Ann's General Hospital, St Ann's Road, London, N15 3TH, then Item 7, HGY/2022/2250 - Land Rear Of 2-14 Kerswell Close, N15 5RP, before returning to the order of business as set out in the agenda.

7. HGY/2022/2250 - LAND REAR OF 2-14 KERSWELL CLOSE, N15 5RP

The Committee considered the application for the redevelopment of the car park, commercial unit and open space at the junction of Kerswell Close and St. Ann's Road and provision of 25 new Council rent homes and an Adult Care Hub in two, four and five-storey buildings. Provision of associated amenity space, including new landscaping, refuse/recycling stores and play space, cycle and refuse/recycling stores and wheelchair parking spaces, and enhancement of existing amenity space within the Kerswell Close Estate.

Gareth Prosser, Planning Officer, introduced the report. In response to the points raised by councillors, the following responses were provided:

- Some members noted that Block B would not have a lift and that, therefore, not all of the homes would be accessible. The Principal Urban Design Officer explained that planning policy did not require all buildings to have lifts. It was noted that three storeys of stairs was considered to be acceptable and it was commented that the proposed stairs would be wide and would have hand rails. It was added that residents who were unable to use stairs would be placed on the ground floor. The applicant team noted that, of the several hundred applicants in Band A on the housing waiting list, fewer than 40% were wheelchair users. It was explained that the reason for including an adult care hub was to ensure that immediate support could be provided. It was noted that there was no requirement for a lift in a four storey building but that the internal sizing of the scheme aimed to ensure that, through the allocations policy, units could be allocated to make sure that those with the greatest need and vulnerability were suitably allocated.
- In relation to a question about the maintenance of gardens, the Head of Development Management noted that there was a condition requiring a management programme for landscaping which would be enforceable. The applicant team added that the contractor and the Housing Delivery Team would have a minimum five year liability period to maintain the new landscaped areas and, following discussions with the Housing Asset Team, there was confidence that there would be sufficient resources for this.
- In relation to the view of the site from St Ann's, it was confirmed that this would be partially screened by a mature, Category B ash tree. The Planning Officer explained that the tree would soften the appearance of the building but would not provide complete shielding.
- Some members noted that the proposal would provide 25 new council rent homes; it was enquired whether these would be formula rent homes and whether they would be deliverable in the current economic climate. The applicant team commented that the economic climate was changeable but that the scheme had been designed based on council rent calculations and was conditioned on that basis.

- Some members enquired whether there was any forward planning for residents whose health needs might deteriorate and where adaptations or lifts may be required later on. The applicant team acknowledged that the health needs of residents could change and that the Council was fairly well-placed to offer support. It was explained that, across the Housing Delivery Programme, approximately 13% of homes were fully accessible and adaptable and approximately 70% were accessible. It was added that the adult care hub would be working to provide good care. The applicant team acknowledged the comments made and stated that they would like to pass this on to the senior management team for the programme for any responses.
- In relation to a query about the car free nature of the development, the Planning Officer explained that the proposal had been reviewed by transportation officers and it had been found that the car park on site had low usage levels. In addition, the surrounding streets did not have a high level of car ownership and it was considered that the loss of parking could be easily absorbed into the surrounding streets. The Transport Planning Team Manager added that the car free restriction would only apply to new residents and that a list of the relevant addresses would be kept on record.
- In relation to the garden and landscaping scheme, the applicant team noted that there would be co-production with residents but that this would take place after the grant of planning permission. The applicant team explained that there had been a number of conversations with stakeholders, both online and in person, and that further efforts would be made to engage with those in the local area; it was understood that there were residents with strong views on how spaces in the area should be used and these views would be sought. It was added that there had been site visits with the local police and ward councillors and it was commented that the planting would be undertaken on areas that were currently quite bare.
- Some members noted that the reason for refusal on the previous application for this site was a lack of affordable homes and it was enquired why the current proposal had fewer affordable homes. The Head of Development Management explained that the previous scheme had proposed 44 1-bed 'pocket' units, which were units smaller than the national space standards, and proposed to have 100% intermediate housing. In contrast, the current scheme proposed only nine 1-bed units, a mixture of larger units, and would include some low cost rented properties which had been identified as the greatest need in the Housing Strategy. It was highlighted that the application would not engage the previous reason for refusal.
- The Committee asked about the road changes and the proposal to have roads shared between vehicles, pedestrians, and other users. The applicant team explained that there had been significant consideration of the central space. It was noted that service access was required but that there would be limited vehicular movement through the site, including a gated entrance, bollards, and other measures to ensure safety.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum.

Cllr Rice moved to remove the requirement that the development be car free. The motion was not seconded.

Following a vote with 9 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a legal agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
3. That the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 31st December 2022 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
5. Planning obligations are usually secured through a S106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the local planning authority and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.
6. Several obligations which would ordinarily be secured through a S106 legal agreement will instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.
7. It is recognised that the Council cannot commence to enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing any planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's Housing service and the Planning service, including the resolution of non-compliances with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.
8. The Council cannot impose conditions on a planning permission requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Placemaking and Housing has confirmed in writing that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented.
9. A summary of the planning obligations for the development is provided below:

1. Carbon offset contribution
 - Carbon offset contribution if the zero-carbon policy requirement is not met, at £2,850 per tCO₂, plus 10% management fee.
 - 'Be Seen' commitment to upload energy performance data
2. Car-Capped Agreement including a £4,000 contribution to amend the Traffic Management Order
3. Car Club Bay and Membership Subsidies
4. Local Employment
5. Employment and Skills Plan
6. Skills Contribution
7. Monitoring Costs
8. Travel Plan
9. Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution
10. Off-site highways and Landscaping working
11. Affordable Homes for Rent

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

10. The Council at the present time is unable to fully evidence its five-year supply of housing land. The 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF should be treated as a material consideration when determining this application, which for decision-taking means granting permission unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. Nevertheless, decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan (relevant policies summarised in this report) unless material considerations indicate otherwise (of which the NPPF is a significant material consideration).

8. HGY/2022/1833 - ST ANN'S GENERAL HOSPITAL, ST ANN'S ROAD, LONDON, N15 3TH

The Committee considered the hybrid application for detailed planning permission for Phase 1A, for: (a) the change of use, conversion and alteration of seven existing hospital buildings for a flexible range of non-residential uses within Use Class E, F1/F2; (b) the demolition of other existing buildings (in accordance with the demolition plan); (c) the erection of new buildings for residential uses (Use Class C3); (d) alterations to the existing access roads and site boundaries to enable the provision of

new vehicular, pedestrian and cycle accesses; (e) landscaping including enlargement of the Peace Garden; and, (f) associated car and cycle parking spaces and servicing spaces;

The demolition of existing buildings and structures in Phases 1B, 2 and 3 (in accordance with the demolition plan);

Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for Phases 1B, 2 and 3, for: (a) the erection of new buildings for residential development (Use Class C3) and a flexible range of non-residential uses within Use Class E, F1/F2; (b) provision of associated pedestrian and cycle accesses; (c) landscaping including enhancements to the St Ann's Hospital Wood and Tottenham Railsides Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); and, (d) car and cycle parking spaces and servicing spaces.

Christopher Smith, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Planning Officer highlighted that there was additional information in the addendum about the use of the new access road opposite Chestnuts Primary School.
- In response to a question about tree groups and the overall impact on the site, the Head of Development Management explained that there would be a net increase in trees. It was noted that not all trees or tree groups were the same quality and that the report included an assessment of the worst case scenario, where all tree groups to be removed were treated as trees in relation to canopy cover, as well as a more realistic assessment which reflected the quality of the existing tree groups. It was stated that the scheme would result in additional tree cover overall. The Senior Arboricultural Officer clarified that a tree group was a collection of one or more trees that was given a group number. It was noted that this could include shrubbery and could be a group of low grade trees as was the case in this instance.
- Some members commented that the presentation contained some technical planning terms which were hard to understand. The Planning Officer explained that 'tenure blind' meant that all units in a development were made to the same standard and design quality whether they were affordable or market housing.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that there would be two openings in the boundary wall on the eastern side of the site which would assist with site permeability. It was also confirmed that the Peace Garden would be open to all.
- In relation to a query about whether the proximity to the hospital would impact on the sale of the homes, the Planning Officer commented that this was a popular area. It was added that the applicant had provided a masterplan which demonstrated how the adjacent hospital site could be developed in the future and it was considered that there was no significant overlooking between the hospital and the new, residential properties. It was confirmed that there would be a boundary between the hospital site and the residential properties.
- In response to a question about affordable housing, the Head of Development Management explained that London Affordable Rent (LAR) was classified as a type of low cost rent but that this was different to social rent which had a particular definition; it was noted that both LAR and social rent were included in the same bracket for calculating the tenure split. It was noted that the Council Housing Team

intended to deliver the units at council rent, also known as formula rent. It was explained that this was not secured by the section 106 agreement; the mechanism was that the applicant was required to give the Council first option to purchase and this would then have to be negotiated.

- Some members raised concerns about the site access that would be used by vehicles, particularly given the concerns raised by Chestnuts Primary School in relation to the health and safety of pedestrians and schoolchildren. The Planning Officer explained that the applicants had secured an access further to the east. It had been confirmed that the applicant would minimise usage of the entrance near the school and had stated that it would only be used during Phase 1a construction if at all; following the construction, this access would only be used by residents. It was added that there was a proposed condition which included reference to the minimisation of traffic opposite the school and this would be subject to further consideration. It was added that there would be a £10,000 contribution in relation to the assessment and monitoring of a detailed construction logistics and management plan.
- Some members drew attention to the change to Heads of Term 1(b)(iii) in the addendum, which provided that the Council would have first option to purchase 50% (up to 161) London Affordable Rent units, and it was enquired whether this could be worded more specifically. The Planning Officer explained that this flexibility, which included a maximum number, was required as the exact number of LAR units would be agreed in later phases. It was noted that the applicant was committing to achieve the proportions set out in the Heads of Terms which would be secured in a legal agreement.
- Some members expressed disappointment with the Waste Management Plan. It was requested that options for centralised waste collections, which reduced vehicular movements, were considered for future applications; the Chair noted this request.
- In relation to a question about the level of car parking proposed, the Transport Planning Team Manager stated that the parking ratio of 0.17, or 167 spaces, was not considered to be high as the London Plan required at least 10% of the total number of units to have disabled parking spaces. It was added that some car provision was considered to be necessary to reflect the demographic of Haringey as some residents required vehicles, such as vans, for work. It was noted that the proposal would be a car capped development as the majority of residents would not have a parking space and would not be able to apply for permits outside of the development.
- It was noted that Head of Term 1(a)(i) said that there would be 40% (38) London Affordable Rent homes. The Planning Officer clarified that there would be 40% LAR homes which would include 38 units for older adults.
- The Head of Development Management confirmed that 5% of trainees would be local residents and this would be secured through the Council's job service.
- In relation to a question about how the contributions for health and police were calculated, the Head of Development Management explained that there was a detailed justification for the policing costs and that this could only cover capital costs. Similarly, the NHS had a model for contributions which the applicant had calculated based on the number of residents.
- In relation to paragraph 2.7 of the report, it was clarified that this would delegate authority to the Head of Development Management to approve planning permission but that this was only relevant in very particular circumstances. For

example, if officers had refused planning permission for a reason specified in paragraph 2.6, such as the absence of a section 106 agreement, the Head of Development Management could approve planning permission if the applicant re-submitted the same application having met all the requirements, such as a finalised section 106 agreement.

- In response to a question about the quality of transport links to the site, the Transport Planning Team Manager noted that there was confidence in the Transport Strategy. It was noted that the scheme would generate improvements to the south west corner of the site, which would provide increased permeability and connectivity to Green Lanes, and that there was good connectivity to St Ann's Road. It was added that there was a Parking Management Plan which was a requirement for all major applications and this would ensure that parking was prioritised for those with disabilities, then those living in family sized units, then those living in smaller units.
- The Senior Arboricultural Officer commented on the removal of trees. It was explained that it was proposed to remove two Category A trees; this included a Midland Fern and a Birch tree which were reasonably short-lived species. It was noted that the relocation of these mature trees would be very difficult as it would involve tree splades and significant aftercare and there would be a risk of transplant shock with no guarantee of success. It was also noted that the removal of any Category B and C trees would require replacement trees to be provided. It was highlighted that officers would ensure that there was not a net loss of trees.
- Some members noted the comments from the Housing Officer which suggested that the scheme should have additional 1-bed units; it was asked whether this would be possible. The Head of Development Management explained that 1-bed units would account for 17% of the units; this was a significant number that was skewed by the provision for older adults which was entirely 1-bed units. It was added that the site had been identified as suitable for family housing and that the scheme would include affordable family units which would also respond to local housing needs.

Carla Mitchell and Russell Miller, StAGS – Friends of St Ann's Green Spaces, spoke in objection to the application. Russell Miller believed that the development would have negative impacts in relation to climate change, wildlife, and equality and would increase car dependency. He stated that the proposals did not meet local, strategic planning policy objectives on climate change, biodiversity, air quality, walking and cycling, and trees, as well as the Greater London Authority (GLA) London Plan and Environment Strategy. He added that St Ann's had a collection of trees in an area of low tree canopy but that the proposal would result in the loss of trees, including 30 tree groups and 260 metres of hedgerow, and that the additional tarmac and pavement would be hotter than the existing greenery and would not help to combat climate change. It was commented that the Haringey and London Policies stated that developments should retain trees of value but that the proposal would remove 112 healthy, mainly category B trees, of which 88% had a life expectancy of over 20 years and 47% had a life expectancy of over 40 years.

Russell Miller noted that the scheme would provide a low car development but that this would include 167 car parking spaces and he considered that this was a significant number. The Haringey Air Quality Action Plan noted that air pollution particularly impacted children and older people, as well as lower income areas such

as St Ann's; it was stated that the loss of green canopy would further impact on health inequality. It was commented that the proposal would remove the Warwick Gardens boundary habitat, a north-south wildlife corridor which linked the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) to Chestnuts Park. It was stated that mature trees and connectivity were core to combating biodiversity decline and it was not felt that swales and green roofs would make up for the loss of mature habitat and ground level vegetation wildlife corridors. Russell Miller urged the Committee to follow planning policy guidance and reject the proposal.

Cathy Graham and Ross Milner, Gardens Residents' Association and Warwick Gardens, spoke in objection to the application. Cathy Graham welcomed the provision of affordable housing as part of the development but expressed concerns that the report and application contained misleading information. She stated that the information set out the GP surgery capacity for patients but did not explain that there would be a net deficiency in health provision for 26,000 residents in the area. She added that the report noted that the south-west link would increase the Passenger Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) to 4 but she believed that this would only apply to 9% of the site and that the remaining parts of the site would have a PTAL of 2. There were also concerns about increasing the density of the site over 100% compared with the 2014 application. In relation to the proposed first floor terraces facing Warwick Gardens, it was stated that the separation distance would be 20 metres, which could be acceptable, but it was noted that the distance from residents' gardens would be seven metres which was not considered to be acceptable. It was acknowledged that the terraces on St Ann's Road would face into the site, away from the conservation area, and it was requested that the units along Warwick Gardens also faced away from residents. Cathy Graham stated that residents were disappointed that the scheme would result in the loss of the ecological corridor and privacy buffer along Warwick Gardens and felt that the proposed planting would not mitigate the adverse impact as the domestic bushes would be lower than the garden walls.

Ross Millner acknowledged the importance of the south-west link but expressed frustration that local residents' suggestions and attempts to engage had been hindered by a lack of clarity over the design and maintenance of the link; it was believed that the applicant would undertake the works but there was uncertainty over who would undertake future maintenance. It was noted that there were some concerns about the impact of Block R on the residents of 67-109 Warwick Gardens in relation to loss of privacy, increased footfall, nuisance, disturbance, and loss of views. It was stated that the south-west link would result in a loss of foliage and that the new six storey block would be 24 metres, 10 metres higher than the existing five storey block. It was added that there would be a loss of the well-used parking space amenity which would be reduced by more than 50%. It was requested that there were assurances that there would be meaningful consultation with residents on the design of the south-west link and that there would be a commitment to landscape and maintain the block's communal gardens in the same aesthetic as the development's green spaces. It was asked that planning permission for the link was granted on the condition that the maintenance of gardens was guaranteed.

Alexander Davis, resident and Governor at Chestnuts Primary School, spoke in objection to the application. He commented that he was representing approximately 650 children and their families who were very concerned about the position of the site

entrance; there had been no engagement with the school or parents and that it had not been mentioned in the Demolition and Construction Plan. He stated that the entrance would increase risks to children, including through inhalation of nitrogen oxide and particulate matter and through safety risks from vehicles. It was noted that many children and parents welcomed the introduction of school streets and low traffic neighbourhoods (LTNs) around the school as they improved air quality and safety but it was considered that the vehicular entrance to the site would undermine the improvements; it was added that the analysis of the entrance did not include the traffic island used by children to get to school. It was also stated that the Mayor of London school air quality audit recommended that school entrances should not be located near busy roads. It was requested that the entrance was only used by pedestrians throughout the life of the site, including construction and development.

Milo, accompanied by Emily Jeffers, and Delilah, accompanied by Tara Kane, were Year 6 school council representatives from Chestnuts Primary School and they spoke in objection to the application. Milo noted that the school was not included on the map or represented for the previous application and he was representing the children at the school for this application. He had identified some flaws on the current map of the new entrance and had circulated an amended map. Milo stated that the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child required adults making decisions to think about the impact on children. Milo said that this planning decision was not thinking about the four and five year olds in the school playground who had the right to a clean and safe environment, to a good quality education, and to play and rest as there would be unclear air and noise from additional traffic. It was added that children at the school were worried about the impact of the additional vehicles using the site entrance opposite the school.

Delilah stated that school council meetings often discussed the large development planned across the road from the school. There were concerns about the number of lorries and skips which would be used outside the school for approximately three years and about the impact of fumes from vehicles on the developing lungs of children at the school. There were also concerns about the trees and natural habitats that would be affected and it was enquired why vehicles could not access the site through the other side of the site to avoid the school. In addition, children at the school were concerned that asthma could develop at any age, particularly in young children, as a result of vehicle pollution; the LTN nearby had redirected additional traffic through St Ann's Road and this application would result in additional vehicle pollution. Delilah asked that the Committee took these points into consideration.

Cllr Tammy Hymas spoke in objection to the application. She acknowledged that the original development on this site was due to have only 14% affordable housing and that the current proposal was a significant improvement; a key reason for this was the campaigning of local groups such as the St Ann's Redevelopment Trust. She stated that local people were best placed to inform about the needs of the community and, given the objections, it was suggested that the scheme required some additional input from the community. It was felt that the provision of 167 car spaces was not ambitious enough and that fewer spaces should be sought. Cllr Hymas noted that the contributions from the young people representing the school were brilliant and articulate. It was commented that, with the implementation of school streets and LTNs, there were now more opportunities for people to walk to school and concerns were

expressed that the proposed vehicular site entrance could undermine this. Cllr Hymas also paid tribute to the campaigners from StAGS and stated that local people did not feel consulted about the proposed removal of trees as part of this application, particularly as the area was identified as deficient in access to nature according to the Mayor of London. In quoting an interview of the St Ann's Redevelopment Trust by the late Dawn Foster, Cllr Hymas stated that local residents often felt left out of consultations about their local area; it was commented that there was demand in Haringey for proper consultation and the political will to deliver this was rising.

Cllr Julie Davies spoke in objection to the application and stated that she was representing residents who had raised concerns in the last few weeks. She acknowledged that some of these concerns had been addressed. She highlighted that it was important for the Council and Catalyst to remember that there was quite a lot of movement in the area in terms of residents, communities, schools, and businesses, and that consultation could become outdated reasonably quickly. It was commented that the demolition and construction plans for this scheme had been circulated recently and that there had been significant concerns from Chestnuts Primary School. Cllr Davies stated that she wanted to put these concerns on record and to seek assurance that the Construction and Management Plan would be drawn up with the community and with the needs of children and the school taken fully into account. It was commented that, in addition to Chestnuts, there were other schools in the area such as St Ann's, Seven Sisters, St Mary's, and Tiverton Primary Schools. It was stated that a number of primary schools had poor air quality and that Haringey Council had committed to tackle this. It was noted that concerns had been raised about large vehicles accessing the site next to Chestnuts Primary School's key stage one playground and that, following discussions with Catalyst, this entrance would be used rarely during demolition and construction. It was added that it would be important to mitigate the impact on all schools around the site to protect children from poor air quality, accidents, and noise. It was noted that Catalyst had worked with the local community in the past but that it was crucial to include residents going forward.

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

- In response to a question about the impact of development, Cathy Graham, Gardens Residents' Association and Warwick Gardens, stated that residents were subject to noise disturbances, such as events in Finsbury Park and Chestnuts Park, and that demolition and construction on the site would further impact residents. It was noted that the development would take place over approximately six years and would be more than a temporary inconvenience. Cathy Graham stated that residents were also concerned about the lack of infrastructure in the local area and felt that the impact of the proposal on primary care was not clear in the planning report. She added that the scheme would affect the ecological corridor and that residents would miss the birds and wildlife; she asked that the corridor be retained or replaced.
- It was enquired whether it was possible to condition the involvement of ward councillors and schools in the Construction Management Plan before it was approved and to have an ongoing steering group with key stakeholders in the area, such as ward councillors, schools, and Residents' Associations. The Head of Development Management noted that this should be possible within the Construction Management Plan.

- In response to a question about overall increases in biodiversity and trees, Russell Miller, StAGS – Friends of St Ann’s Green Spaces, commented that he was an Arboricultural and Ecological Consultant. He stated that St Ann’s had good maturity and connectivity of wildlife corridors. It was noted that there were some beneficial proposals in the development, such as green roofs, but that there would be a cull of the existing canopy cover and an interruption of the wildlife network.

Cllr Mike Hakata spoke in support of the application. He stated that, thanks to the work of local campaigns, the current proposals for development were greatly improved. He commented that there was a desperate need for affordable homes in the borough and that this scheme would deliver 60% affordable homes. It was acknowledged that there had been significant work to provide a good development and it was suggested that further work could be done to make the development exemplary. It was commented that this could be assisted with local knowledge from groups such as StAGS and it was queried whether it would be possible to retain mature hedgerows and trees. Cllr Hakata hoped that the developer would continue to discuss with residents and noted that it was still possible for the development to be exemplary by retaining hedgerows and trees.

Cllr Ruth Gordon spoke in support of the application. She noted that the development would support placemaking in the borough and respond to the housing crisis. She stated that the scheme would enable a 15 minute neighbourhood and would create a community, including workspaces. It was commented that approximately 58% of residents in Haringey were housed in the private rented sector, which was increasingly expensive, and it was noted that the application would provide 995 new homes, including 161 homes at formula rent, 38 homes for older residents, and 22 homes for key NHS staff.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. David Wakeford, Catalyst, explained that the proposal aimed to deliver hundreds of genuinely affordable homes with a good number of family homes. It was noted that Haringey Council was also proposing to manage 150 homes to be let at social rent, including a social rented block for older adults and an option for 50 affordable homes to be taken on by a community organisation. In addition to homes, it was stated that there would be non-residential uses, such as affordable workspaces, a supermarket, and health and leisure opportunities. It was noted that the plans had been commended for their high quality and there had been positive comments from the Council’s Design Officer and the Quality Review Panel (QRP).

David Wakeford explained that the scheme included a number of new pedestrian entrances; there would also be two new vehicle entrances which were the same as the 2014 planning permission. It was noted that there were approximately 14,000 vehicle movements per day in the area and the proposal would add to this by 0.1%. The concerns raised by the school representatives were acknowledged and it was noted that the applicant was looking to meet and discuss the issues. It was stated that the applicant had worked closely with the local community to create an improved scheme; the latest improvements included an adapted Traffic Management Plan so that the gate closest to the school would be used for emergency access only in the first year and then would be used by residents only.

It was stated that the landscape design was central throughout the scheme and that as many trees as possible would be retained; the proposal would retain and replace the largest number of trees in the site's history and the QRP had supported the ambition to retain a good number of trees. It was also noted that the Peace Garden would be approximately three times larger and would be accessible by the local community. It was commented that the SINC would be protected and enlarged and that public realm improvements would be substantial and would have a high design quality.

In relation to the climate emergency, David Wakeford stated that approximately 20% of carbon emissions in the UK were generated from burning gas in homes. It was highlighted that the proposal would deliver energy efficient, modern homes which would be gas free; this would save 812,000kg of carbon annually which was the equivalent of 32,000 mature trees. It was added that the scheme would provide affordable housing, substantial public realm improvements, and would have a meaningful impact on biodiversity and climate change.

In response to the points raised by councillors, the following responses were provided:

- In relation to a question about the proposed use of the water tower, the applicant team explained that this was an unusual and iconic building; flexible use had been sought as the use had not been decided yet. In terms of overlooking, it was noted that the water tower was equivalent to a six storey building but that the windows were quite narrow. Some members suggested that it could be beneficial to include a condition requiring that the windows in the water tower be opaque. The applicant team noted that the feasibility of this would depend on the final use of the building. It was added that the overlooking would be at a significant distance of approximately 30 metres.
- The applicant team explained that the Peace Garden would be completed by the first occupation of the site and would be linked to the SINC. The Head of Development Management added that Head of Term 15 contained requirements in relation to the Peace Garden and that these obligations would need to be fulfilled prior to occupation.
- David Wakeford clarified that there would be some off-site fossil fuel implications, such as the use of electricity from the grid, but that the site itself would be fossil fuel free.
- In response to a query, it was noted that the 38 units for older people would be managed by the Council. It was commented that the specifics about how units were allocated would need to be addressed by the relevant Housing Officer.
- David Wakeford clarified that the SINC would not be removed.
- It was noted that some concerns had been raised in the objections about the north-south connectivity from the SINC to Chestnuts Park, about the degree of change to the SINC, and about the proposed gardens and permeability at ground level. The applicant team noted that there would be a new, significant green corridor; this would require some time to develop but would have space to grow at the centre of the site. In relation to the area of concern for objectors, this was primarily a hedge, or tree group, which formed a boundary which would become the back of the proposed gardens. It was explained that the hedge would be retained in part and that, where the applicant had been unable to commit to retaining, there would be new planting of native species with higher canopy coverage along the boundary wall.

- Some members suggested that it would be beneficial, in order to ensure that solar panels were operational, to amend Condition 28(b) so that the reference to ‘within six months’ would allow for the provision of evidence of installation within the first six month period. It was also requested that there be a follow up after two years to provide evidence that the solar panels had been operational throughout their lifetime. It was asked that this condition be applied to all future applications. The Climate Change Manager explained that there would be ongoing monitoring; the data would be held by the Greater London Authority (GLA) but the Council would have sight of the data. It was noted that this was a new GLA policy as part of the London Plan 2021 and that all major applications would be subject to these arrangements. The Head of Development Management added that this could be monitored live by the GLA who could identify issues and liaise with sites to ensure that solar panels were operational. The Climate Change Manager acknowledged that the wording of Condition 28(b) could be amended for clarity in relation to the first six months of occupation.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum, and with the following amendments:

- To update the Demolition and Construction Management Plans. It was noted that some changes had been agreed already but the outstanding points relating to Conditions 8, 9, 10, and 11 would involve the inclusion of an additional bullet point to each condition to set out additional requirements relating to: evidence of engagement with local residents, local groups, and schools and the measures for ongoing engagement.
- To enhance the wording of Head of Term 17 relating to the Residents’ Liaison Group to include additional detail. It was requested that the Committee delegated the wording of this Head of Term to the Head of Development Management, to be agreed after consultation with the Chair. It was noted that this would include reference to the relevant conditions so that the establishment of the Group would be set up as a method of approving other Plans.
- To enhance the wording of Condition 28(b) to require appropriate monitoring during the first six months of occupation. It was requested that the Committee delegated the wording of this Head of Term to the Head of Development Management, to be agreed after consultation with the Chair.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability or the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a legal agreement providing the obligations as set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 23rd December 2022 or within such extended time as the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability/Head of Development Management shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and

3. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission shall be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions and informatives; and
4. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions and informatives 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.

Summary Lists of Conditions, Informatives and Heads of Terms

Summary of Conditions (a full list is included in Appendix 1)

- 1) Time limit
- 2) Approved plans and documents
- 3) Phasing plan
- 4) Delivery and servicing plan
- 5) West-East connections
- 6) Whole life carbon assessment
- 7) Post construction monitoring
- 8) Demolition logistics plan
- 9) Demolition environmental management plan
- 10) Construction logistics plan
- 11) Construction environmental management plan
- 12) Secured by design
- 13) Air quality and dust management
- 14) NRMM
- 15) Plant and machinery
- 16) Remediation strategy
- 17) Verification report
- 18) Monitoring and maintenance plan (contamination)
- 19) Unexpected contamination
- 20) Borehole management
- 21) Piling management statement
- 22) Drainage systems
- 23) Source protection strategy
- 24) Water pressure
- 25) Considerate contractor
- 26) Arboricultural method statement (Phase 1B)
- 27) Arboricultural method statement
- 28) Revised energy statement
- 29) Overheating
- 30) Building user guide
- 31) Energy monitoring
- 32) Ecological enhancement
- 33) Non-residential uses
- 34) Hours of operation

- 35) Permitted development
- 36) Rainwater harvesting
- 37) Satellite dishes
- 38) Tree replacement
- 39) Water use
- 40) PVs
- 41) Broadband
- 42) Noise assessment
- 43) Public highway
- 44) Drainage management and maintenance plan
- 45) Boundary wall
- 46) Public areas (management and maintenance)
- 47) Courtyard access
- 48) Electric charge points (vehicular)
- 49) Written scheme of investigation
- 50) External lighting
- 51) Car parking management (Phase 1A)
- 52) Delivery and servicing (Phase 1A)
- 53) Arboricultural method statement (Phase 1A)
- 54) Cycle storage (Phase 1A)
- 55) Landscaping (Phase 1A)
- 56) Materials (Phase 1A)
- 57) Green roofs (Phase 1A)
- 58) Fire strategy (Phase 1A)
- 59) Fire strategy statement (Phase 1A)
- 60) Surface water drainage (Phase 1A)
- 61) Reserved matters submissions (Outline)
- 62) Reserved matters timeframe (Outline)
- 63) Reserved matters compliance statement (Outline)
- 64) Outline parameters (Outline)
- 65) Drawing references (Outline)
- 66) Cycle provision (Outline)
- 67) Accessible housing (Outline)
- 68) Landscaping (Outline)
- 69) Fire statement (Outline)
- 70) Ecological impact assessment (Outline)
- 71) Car parking management (Outline)
- 72) Green roofs (Outline)
- 73) Circular economy statement (Outline)
- 74) Surface water drainage (Outline)
- 75) Boundary walls (Outline)
- 76) Energy strategy (Outline)
- 77) Overheating (Outline)
- 78) Climate change adaptation (Outline)
- 79) District energy network connection**

Summary of Informatives (a full list is included in Appendix 1)

- 1) Proactive statement
- 2) CIL

- 3) Signage
- 4) Naming and numbering
- 5) Legal agreements
- 6) Hours of working**
- 7) Party Wall Act**
- 8) Asbestos survey
- 9) Designing out crime
- 10) Highway protection
- 11) Sewer network
- 12) Network rail

Summary of Section 106 Heads of Terms

- 1) Provision of 60% affordable housing across all phases
 - a. 39% (239) affordable housing in Phase 1A
 - i. 40% (38) London Affordable Rent homes to be provided as older adults accommodation by the Council
 - ii. 60% Intermediate homes (22 London Living Rent and 34 Shared Ownership)
 - b. Affordable housing phasing plan for the outline component to be submitted with the reserved matters application for Phase 1B. The plan shall include details of:
 - i. NHS key worker housing provision
 - ii. Community-led housing provision
 - iii. How the Council shall have first option to purchase **50% (up to 161)** London Affordable Rent units to be provided as Council rented accommodation
 - iv. London Living Rent housing provision
 - v. Shared Ownership housing provision
 - c. Early-stage viability review**
- 2) Non-Residential and Meanwhile Uses Plan
 - a. Details of non-residential uses to be confirmed
 - i. Minimum **225**sqm of affordable workspace to be provided at maximum 50% of market rate for **15** years aimed at local creative entrepreneurs and businesses
 - ii. Affordable workspace to be provided in accordance with the applicant's affordable workspace vision strategy
 - iii. Minimum of 2,000sqm of workspace to be provided overall
 - iv. Details of community space provision to be confirmed
 - v. Small supermarket (Class E) shall be provided in Phase 3
 - vi. **Details of cultural strategist and/ or workspace provider**
 - b. Details of meanwhile uses to be confirmed
 - i. Applicant shall investigate the potential for existing buildings within Phases 2 and 3 to be made available for meanwhile uses prior to their demolition
 - ii. Best endeavours shall be made to ensure buildings within Phases 2 and 3 are retained and made available for meanwhile uses by the local community for as long as possible

- 3) Car Club
 - a. Up to five car club parking spaces secured on site
 - b. £50 credit per resident per year (for up to two residents per unit) for two years (estimated maximum of £116,000)

- 4) Site-Wide Travel Plan
 - a. To include details of welcome packs that will be provided to all new residents (to include information on public transport and cycling/walking connections)
 - b. To include details of initiatives to reduce parking demand for non-residential properties
 - c. To appoint a travel plan co-ordinator to work in collaboration with the Council for a minimum of five years
 - d. Provision of a contribution of £2,000 per annum for five years towards monitoring of the travel plan

- 5) Highway Works (Section 278)
 - a. Submit detailed designs and Stage 1 and 2 Safety Audits to the Council, and enter into a Section 278 agreement with the Council, for the following works:
 - i. Creation of 2no. vehicle accesses to the site from St Ann's Road
 - ii. Reinstatement of the pedestrian footway outside the existing vehicle access
 - iii. Creation of a new pedestrian and cycle access to the site at the junction of Warwick Gardens and Stanhope Gardens, including all associated remediation works to the existing car park
 - iv. Creation of 2no. new pedestrian crossings on St Ann's Road (1no. signalised crossing and 1no. zebra crossing)
 - v. All associated lining and signing works

- 6) Car Capped Development
 - a. Provision of details as to how occupiers and users of the development shall not be able to apply for new parking permits
 - b. Provision of a contribution of £4,000 towards the amendment of a traffic management order for this purpose

- 7) Traffic Management Measures
 - a. Provide a contribution of £80,000 towards the feasibility, design and consultation relating to the implementation of traffic management measures in the area surrounding the site

- 8) Legible London
 - a. Provide a contribution, to be paid to Transport for London, of £110,000 towards the provision of Legible London signage

- 9) St Ann's Cycle Lane
 - a. Provide a contribution of £150,000 towards a study of the feasibility and design of a protected cycle track on St Ann's Road.

- 10) Construction Logistics and Management

- a. Provide a contribution of £10,000 towards the assessment and monitoring of a detailed construction logistics and management plan (secured by condition)

11) Accident Vision Zero

- a. Provision of a contribution of £24,000 towards reducing traffic accidents in the vicinity of the application site and supporting 'healthy streets'

12) Employment and Skills

- a. Submission of an employment and skills plan
- b. No less than 20% of the peak construction workforce to be Haringey residents
- c. Provision of skills-based training to the 20% referenced above
- d. 5% of the peak workforce to be provided with traineeships
- e. Provision of a construction apprenticeships at one per £3m development construction cost up to a maximum of 10% of total construction workforce
- f. Provision of a £1,500 support contribution per apprentice
- g. Provision of no less than five STEM/career inspirational sessions per construction phase
- h. Regular liaison with the Council to allow local businesses and suppliers to tender for works
- i. Other requirements as agreed in discussions with the Council's Employment and Skills Officer

13) Connection to a Future District Energy Network (DEN)

- a. **Deliver a single site-wide connection point**
- b. Connect each phase of the development to the DEN, if feasible **and the offer to connect is commercially viable and on fair and reasonable terms**
- c. Payment of a charge to connect to the DEN **based on avoided costs arising from the connection**
- d. Provision of a **preferred** heating strategy fall-back option if connection to the DEN is not feasible for each phase
- e. **The preferred fall-back heating strategy shall maximise the scope for avoided spend**
- f. **If the developer chooses another strategy that does not create the same level of avoided costs, they shall still pay the connection charges if they have followed a fall-back strategy which maximises avoided costs**

14) Energy Plan

- a. An **updated energy plan** is to be provided **prior to the commencement of each phase**
- b. Provision of a contribution to offset the carbon emissions of the development where not met on site against the zero-carbon target
- c. Estimate of the carbon offset figure is £841,605 (**based on an air source heat pump scenario**) for the whole development which is to be reviewed once the amended **energy plan** has been reviewed by the Council **by phase**

- d. Amended energy statements to be provided on a phase-by-phase basis and appropriate carbon offset contributions to be provided on agreement of each energy statement
- e. **Submit a Sustainability Review confirming the as-built details of the development that is to be provided on first occupation of each block**

15) Public Open Space Access and Management Plan

- a. Details of access to and management/maintenance of the public open space areas within the development including the expanded Peace Garden

16) South-West Link Provision

- a. Details regarding design and management of the new pedestrian and cycle link shall be submitted to the Council prior to the commencement of works to the development
- b. Designs shall fully consider security measures including provision of bollards, CCTV and number plate recognition as appropriate
- c. Management shall ensure that the link is provided in perpetuity
- d. Works to provide the link shall be completed under licence by the applicant

17) Residents Liaison Group

- a. The applicant shall use reasonable endeavours to run, facilitate and organise quarterly meetings with local residents and businesses during the demolition and construction works relating to the whole development

18) Retention of Architects

- a. The architects for this development (Karakusevic Carson Architects) shall be retained for the duration of the development

19) Phasing of CIL Payments

- a. A detailed CIL payment phasing plan shall be submitted and agreed by the Council prior to the commencement of the development

20) Other Financial Contributions

- a. Contribution towards improvement of health services in the local area of **£150,000**
- b. Contribution towards local policing £70,905.61

21) Monitoring

Provision of a financial contribution of £50,000 towards monitoring of the planning obligations

- 5. In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.
- 6. In the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above not being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2) 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 affordable housing, would fail to contribute towards the provision of mixed and balanced communities in the local area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM13 of the Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP2 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policies H4 and H13 of the London Plan.
2. The proposed development, in the absence of non-residential uses including workspace and affordable workspace and a commitment towards providing meanwhile uses on-site during the construction period would fail to adequately create a vibrant mixed-use neighbourhood that sufficiently activates the public realm areas within the site, would fail to create sufficient end user jobs and develop the local economy, and would fail to contribute towards the development of the creative community in the local area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Site Allocation SA28 of the Site Allocations DPD 2017, Policies SD7 and E3 of the London Plan 20121, Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy SP8 of the Local Plan 2017.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing the new opening in the boundary wall in the south-west corner of the application site, would fail to improve access to public transport connections and would not meet the requirements of Site Allocation SA28. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM55 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and Site Allocation SA28 of the Site Allocations DPD 2017.
4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team and to provide other employment initiatives 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 Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.
5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing measures towards an appropriate connection to the Council's District Energy Network, should it become available, and 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 Policy SI2 of the London Plan, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD 2017.
6. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing measures to retain the existing architects, could result in a significant reduction in the completed design quality of the development. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP11 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD 2017.
7. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sustainable transport measures and public highway works, would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T1, T2, T6, T6.1 and T7,

Local Plan Policy SP7 and Policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD.

7. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (6) 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 or Head of Development Management 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 (6) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

At 9.10pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment. The meeting resumed at 9.15pm.

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 5 December 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 5TH DECEMBER, 2022, 7.00 - 10.15 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor George Dunstall, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Matt White, and Councillor Alexandra Worrell.

In attendance: Councillor Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council Housebuilding, Placemaking, and Development; Councillor Alessandra Rossetti, Alexandra ward; Councillor Sarah Williams, Cabinet Member for Finance and Local Investment and West Green ward.

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 Yvonne Say.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Nicola Bartlett declared an interest in relation to Item 8, HGY/2022/0823 and HGY/2022/2816 - Broadwater Farm Estate, N17, and Tangmere, Willan Road, N17 6NA, as she supported the scheme as a ward councillor. It was clarified that she would leave the room for the duration of the item and would not take part in the discussion or voting on the item.

6. MINUTES

It was noted that the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 5 September 2022 would be considered at the next meeting.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2022/0823 AND HGY/2022/2816 - BROADWATER FARM ESTATE, N17, AND TANGMERE, WILLAN ROAD, N17 6NA

Cllr Bartlett left the room at 7.05pm.

The Committee considered an application for Planning Permission (HGY/2022/0823): Demolition of the existing buildings and structures and erection of new mixed-use buildings including residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business and service (Class E) and local community and learning (Class F) floorspace; energy centre (sui generis); together with landscaped public realm and amenity spaces; public realm and highways works; car-parking; cycle parking; refuse and recycling facilities; and other associated works. Site comprising: Tangmere and Northolt Blocks (including Stapleford North Wing): Energy Centre; Medical Centre; Enterprise Centre; and former Moselle school site, at Broadwater Farm Estate.

The Committee also considered an application for Listed Building Consent (HGY/2022/2816): Listed building consent for the removal of Grade II listed mosaic mural to facilitate its re-erection in a new location.

Christopher Smith, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to a query about ensuring that there were no mould and damp issues, the Planning Officer noted that the units would have dual or triple aspect, which would maximise natural ventilation, and would be built to a high standard. The Climate Change Manager added that there would be mechanical ventilation and that there was external amenity space which residents could use to dry clothes.
- It was enquired why it was necessary to move the mural. The Planning Officer explained that the building with the mural needed to be demolished because of its structural condition. It was noted that the mural would be stored whilst a restoration plan was developed and there were conditions relating to this that had been recommended by the Conservation Officer and Historic England. The Head of Development Management added that there was a heritage benefit in moving and displaying the mural in a more appropriate location.
- It was noted that there would be a £30,000 contribution towards reinstating a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The Planning Officer believed that there was an existing CPZ in the area but that it had lapsed. It was stated that there was an ambition to reinstate the CPZ and the payment would include a consultation process.
- In relation to parking, it was commented that the area had poor connectivity to public transport. The Transport Planning Team Manager noted that a parking survey had been conducted and had determined that 93% of the units across the wider estate, including the new units, would have access to a car parking space; it was considered that there was sufficient parking.

- The Planning Officer clarified that a scoping request had been undertaken to determine whether an Environmental Impact Assessment was required. There had been consultation with various environmental bodies and it was considered that the area was quite a dense, urban environment; as such, the development was not inconsistent with the area and an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required.
- In relation to the housing mix of the scheme, some members noted that a large number of 1-bed units was proposed; it was acknowledged that there were wider mixes across the estate but it was enquired why additional 1-bed units were planned in this area. The Planning Officer noted this point and explained that policies could be applied flexibly where there was over 75% affordable housing. It was added that there would also be a significant increase in family homes on the estate with an additional 40 3-bed and 4-bed homes, which was a 62.5% increase. It was considered, on balance, that this was a significant benefit which could justify the number of 1-bed units.
- Some members commented that the Greater London Authority (GLA) felt that the scheme proposed too much parking and it was asked whether the level of parking could be reduced. The Transport Planning Team Manager noted that the provision of parking would be 0.3% per unit which amounted to an overall reduction. It was explained that this level had been considered as part of the wider area as it would not be possible to exclude residents from applying for a parking permit in the estate.
- It was noted that the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) had expressed some fire safety concerns in relation to single staircases. The Planning Officer noted that this was considered to be a minor issue; the Building Control Team believed that this could be resolved at a later stage and that the scheme was suitable to proceed. It was highlighted that there were conditions which covered fire safety, that the GLA would further review the arrangements, and that there were additional layers of assessment before the build commenced; this would include the ability to make changes if required. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that a single staircase could be safe but that a key requirement was to have a detailed fire engineering analysis.
- In relation to some concerns that were raised about the entrance lobbies, the Planning Officer noted that the proposed lobbies would be spacious and would have a high quality design. It was added that the materials would be subject to approval, as set out in the conditions. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the entrances would be well-designed and located in prominent locations; there would be large windows so that the lobbies would be visible from the street and there would be a double entrance to ensure security and to avoid tailgating.
- It was noted that the proposed nine storey block would have two lifts and it was enquired whether there would be two staircases. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that there was new legislation and policy and, in particular, a new government circular which stated that the key requirement for very tall buildings would be a detailed fire engineering analysis; it was commented that there was not necessarily a requirement for two staircases. It was confirmed that the scheme would have a staircase and a number of fire safety measures that would be considered in the fire engineering analysis and this would be reviewed by Building Control.
- The Planning Officer understood that the scheme would be seeking at least silver certification for Designing Out Crime.

- The Transport Planning Team Manager confirmed that the walking and cycling improvements contribution of £100,000 would enable the site to be linked with Cycle Superhighway 1 and Lordship Lane. It was noted that the contribution was aimed to cover the design feasibility costs and that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other funds would be sought to implement a road extension into the site.

The Chair noted that there had been two objectors but that, as one objector was unwell and unable to attend the meeting, there would be up to six minutes to speak in objection; the same amount of time would be given to those speaking in support.

Jacob Secker, Broadwater Farm Residents' Association, spoke in objection to the application. He explained that he objected to the demolition of the health centre; although the presentation had stated that it needed refurbishment, he noted that it had been built in 1996 and he was not aware that works were required. He stated that the demolition would breach site allocation 61 of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2017 as the replacement, which would be 266sqm and would have one consulting room, would not match the capacity of existing facilities, which was 370sqm with four consulting rooms and a midwife's room. It was believed that the proposal to have a wellbeing hub with one room, as shown in the images, was different to the information that had been presented as part of the consultation.

It was noted that the proposal would have 35% 3-bed and 4-bed units for family housing but Jacob Secker believed that this should be 55% based on the Housing Strategy. He stated that the Planning Statement to the GLA in April 2022 was misleading as it stated that the number of 3-bed and 4-bed units had been reduced to 35% as a result of local housing need; he said that larger units were required. He suggested that the plans included more 1-bed units as they were cheaper to build. He believed that the units needed to better reflect the estate and that more 3-bed and 4-bed units were required as overcrowding was a serious problem in the area. It was suggested that including additional 3-bed and 4-bed units would not necessarily cause delays as the housing mix could be changed in later plans.

In relation to parking, there were concerns that a CPZ would be introduced in the area. Jacob Secker stated that it was misleading to say that residents had discussed a CPZ as part of the ballot; they believed that parking was free and more residents would have voted against the plans if they had known that there would be parking charges. He added that there had been a previous petition in 2017 against having a CPZ in the area. It was commented that residents wanted a free estate parking scheme.

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

- In relation to a query about the health provision, the Head of Development Management commented that the site allocation guidelines referred to capacity rather than floorspace specifically. It was noted that the applicant had undertaken significant engagement on this and that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) was in strong support and considered that the provision would meet local need.
- The Transport Planning Team Manager clarified that there were two parking elements in the area; there were adopted roads in the estate, which were public

highways and would require a parking scheme, and there were other roads which belonged to the Housing Team, which had their own housing parking schemes.

- In relation to a query about the reduction in 3-bed and 4-bed units, the Head of Development Management stated that the site allocation had a requirement to engage with existing residents to meet housing needs. It was explained that, where homes were being demolished and replaced, there was a requirement to re-provide homes for the existing residents and it was noted that, in this case, the number of family units would be increasing significantly. The Planning Officer clarified that the current provision on site was 70% 1-bed, 3% 2-bed, 25% 3-bed, and 1% 4-bed. In the proposals, there was a slight reduction in 3-bed units from 25% to 20% but a significant increase in larger family accommodation from 1% to 15% 4-bed units.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. David Sherrington, Programme Director for Broadwater Farm, stated that responses to the issues raised by the objector were included in the application and the agenda pack but that further responses could be provided if required. He said that residents had played a central role in the design of the scheme, as set out in the Community Design Statement, and would continue to be a part of the co-design process. It was noted that this scheme was part of a wider programme of estate regeneration which would provide better links to the surrounding area and opportunities for jobs, skills, and training; it was noted that all proposals for the area would be presented to the Committee in due course.

Maureen Duncan, Headteacher at The Brook, stated that she was speaking on behalf of local Headteachers and residents with school children. She said that she supported the scheme and felt that it would be significant for the estate which had lived with an undeserved reputation for a number of years. She commented that the design group for the project discussed the future vision for the estate and gave stakeholders opportunities to present ideas. It was noted that overcrowding was an issue in the estate and that the proposal would provide 294 homes with a significant number of 3-bed and 4-bed homes. It was stated that the scheme would help residents to feel safer with the improved pavements and roads and would provide more leisure and play space which would help to give young people a sense of belonging. It was believed that the project would improve the area by providing space for small businesses, a wellbeing centre, and a shop. It was felt that the proposals were ambitious and forward thinking and the estate transformation was welcomed for the vibrant and inclusive community in the Broadwater Estate.

Cllr Ruth Gordon spoke in support of the application. She stated that this was a key moment for the scheme in Broadwater Farm which had been developed over a long period of time after consulting and engaging with residents. She highlighted that the scheme would provide 100% council homes and had turned the discovery of health and safety issues in Tangmere Block into an opportunity to rejuvenate the area. Cllr Gordon stated that she believed this was the reason why 85% of residents had voted for the estate regeneration. It was noted that the homes would be high quality and spacious, would have dual or triple aspect, and that every unit would have a balcony, garden, or veranda. It was added that there would be improvements to the wider area, with new streets and facilities, and it was considered a good example for how to deliver placemaking.

Cllr Sarah Williams spoke in support of the application. She stated that she was happy to commend the scheme. She noted support for the detailed engagement process which had resulted in flexibility for residents, including a choice between open plan or combined kitchen and living areas.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to ventilation, the applicant team explained that the scheme was designed to be ventilated mechanically and there would be full extraction units for all kitchens and bathrooms. It was added that the dual aspect homes also had the option of cross-ventilation for drying clothes and overheating issues.
- It was confirmed that the applicant team had met with the Metropolitan Police Secured By Design officers three times throughout the design process and this had resulted in amendments to aspects of the scheme such as public spaces and the interface with the car parking undercrofts. The applicant had also worked with residents to understand the locations on the estate that currently felt unsafe.
- It was noted that the non-residential uses proposed could create up to 25 jobs; the applicant team explained that this had been calculated using the employment density guide and the proposed uses as set out in the application.
- It was clarified that the current health centre would not be demolished until the new, alternative provision was in place. The applicant team explained that the new Wellbeing Hub was designed to be a flexible space and could be expanded if required. It was noted that there was additional GP provision to the north of the estate, approximately 10 minutes' walk away, and it was stated that the area was reasonably well served in terms of medical facilities.
- The applicant team noted that it was proposed to introduce a Traffic Management Order (TMO) onto the housing land on the estate which would include a free parking permit for residents but with a cost for every permit beyond this. It was commented that this was different to the arrangements for a CPZ.
- Some concerns were expressed about the existing Enterprise Centre in the area and it was queried whether the new proposals would be effective. The applicant team acknowledged these concerns and explained that the new plans would involve close working with the Economic Development Team to agree a new lease with social value outcomes that would be monitored. It was added that the existing units suffered from design, deterioration, and anti-social behaviour issues and it was believed that the outcomes would be improved with better design and management.
- In relation to courtyard access, the applicant team explained that it was important to have a balance between accessibility and security. It was anticipated that the gates would be open during the day and locked at night but it was clarified that residents would have key fobs and would be able to access the areas at all times.
- Some members raised concerns that bike storage rooms were not used by residents due to security concerns. The applicant team explained that a certain number of cycle parking spaces needed to be provided under the planning requirements but that there was some additional storage space within each home which could accommodate a bike or buggy. It was added that this aimed to reduce the impact of storage on the ground floor and provide some flexibility for residents.
- Some members noted that the quantity of play space had been queried at the pre-application stage and expressed concerns about the proposed level of hardstanding. The applicant team noted that the courtyard for each block would have doorstep play for those under four years of age and that these areas would

include as much planting as possible. It was noted that the central park had more areas of hardstanding which were intended to be used by residents for flexible purposes, including some waterplay for younger children. For older children and young people, it was noted that Lordship Recreation Ground was located nearby. The Programme Director for Broadwater Farm added that there would be further work with residents in relation to the existing courtyards and whether these should be further developed into play space or other uses.

It was highlighted that the Committee was asked to consider two applications for planning permission and Listed Building Consent. It was confirmed that the recommendation in both cases was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum.

Following a vote with 9 votes in favour, 0 vote against, and 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the measures set out in the heads of terms below.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions (planning permission) 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.
3. That the measures referred to in resolution (1) above are to be completed no later than 23rd December 2022 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following receipt of written confirmation from the Director of Placemaking and Housing regarding the measures in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Listed Building Consent – HGY/2022/2816

5. To GRANT listed building consent and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability is authorised to issue the listed building consent and impose conditions and informatives.
6. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended conditions (listed building

consent) 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.

Summary of Conditions and Planning Measures

Planning Permission – HGY/2022/0823

Conditions

- 1) Three years to commence works
- 2) Drawing numbers
- 3) Use class restrictions
- 4) Permitted development restrictions
- 5) Finishing materials
- 6) Wheelchair user dwellings
- 7) Aerial restrictions
- 8) Secured by design residential
- 9) Secured by design commercial
- 10) External lighting
- 11) Ecological appraisal
- 12) Landscaping
- 13) Plant noise limitations
- 14) Cycle parking
- 15) Delivery and servicing
- 16) Council rented homes
- 17) Highway works
- 18) Electric vehicle charging
- 19) Architect retention
- 20) Contamination remediation
- 21) Unexpected contamination
- 22) Considerate constructor scheme
- 23) Construction environmental management plan
- 24) Surface water drainage scheme
- 25) Drainage management and maintenance plan
- 26) Construction phase fire strategy
- 27) Occupation phase fire strategy statement
- 28) Evacuation lifts details
- 29) Updated air quality assessment
- 30) Road safety audits
- 31) Car parking management strategy
- 32) Piling method statement
- 33) Water network upgrades
- 34) Play space details
- 35) Balcony screens
- 36) Digital connectivity infrastructure
- 37) Arboricultural method statement
- 38) Highway condition survey
- 39) Courtyard access controls
- 40) Moselle culvert maintenance and improvements

- 41) Moselle culvert survey
- 42) Boundary treatments and access controls
- 43) Energy statement
- 44) Energy assessment
- 45) Revised carbon offset calculation
- 46) Future design of the energy centre
- 47) Energy monitoring
- 48) Residential overheating report
- 49) Non-residential overheating report
- 50) Building user guide
- 51) BREEAM new construction
- 52) Living roofs
- 53) Circular economy monitoring
- 54) Whole life carbon assessment
- 55) Ecological enhancement measures
- 56) Pre-demolition audit
- 57) Climate change mitigation measures
- 58) Scheme for energy monitoring

Informatives

- 1) Proactive statement
 - 2) CIL
 - 3) Signage
 - 4) Naming and numbering
 - 5) Asbestos survey
 - 6) Water pressure
 - 7) Designing out crime
 - 8) Environmental permits
 - 9) Groundwater protection
7. The Council cannot impose conditions on planning permissions requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Placemaking and Housing has confirmed in writing that the payment of the contributions and for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments/provided before the proposed development is implemented/occupied.
8. Several obligations which would ordinarily be secured through a S106 legal agreement will instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.
9. It is recognised that the Council cannot commence to enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing any planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's Housing service and the Planning service, including the resolution of non-compliances with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.

10. The Council cannot impose conditions on planning permissions requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Placemaking and Housing has confirmed in writing that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented.

11. Summary of the planning obligations for the development is provided below:

- Affordable housing – provision of all new homes at Council rents
- Affordable workspace
- Parking permit restrictions
- CPZ re-instatement, review and expansion contribution (£30,000)
- Amendments to traffic management order (£5,000)
- Residential and commercial travel plans
- Travel plan monitoring (£10,000)
- Highway works agreement (in consultation with TfL)
- Stopping up works agreement
- Walking and cycling improvements contributions (£100,000)
- Accident reduction strategy for local road junctions (£150,000)
- Future connection to district heating network
- Carbon offsetting contribution if no connection to energy network
- Management and maintenance of public realm
- Delivery of social value measures secured through procurement process
- Obligations monitoring contribution

Listed Building Consent – HGY/2022/2816

Conditions

- 1) Three years to commence works
- 2) Drawing numbers
- 3) Notification of each phase of work
- 4) Information prior to detachment of mural
- 5) Information prior to storage of mural
- 6) Information prior to restoration works
- 7) Information prior to completion of restoration
- 8) Information prior to re-erection of mural
- 9) Inspection, maintenance plan and photographic record

Cllr Bartlett did not take part in the discussion or voting on this item and re-entered the room at the end of the item at 8.25pm.

At 8.25pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment. The meeting resumed at 8.30pm.

9. HGY/2022/2354 - WOODRIDINGS COURT, CRESCENT ROAD, N22 7RX

The Committee considered an application for redevelopment of the derelict undercroft car park behind Woodridings Court and provision of 33 new Council rent in four and five storey buildings. Provision of associated amenity space, cycle and wheelchair parking spaces, and enhancement of existing amenity space at the front of Woodridings Court, including new landscaping, refuse/recycling stores and play space.

Valerie Okeiyi, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Head of Development Management confirmed that the proposal was for council rent units, also known as formula rent; it was noted that any changes would require a variation. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that council rent and London Affordable Rent (LAR) were both considered to be low cost rent for planning purposes. In this case, reference to council rent was included in the description for the development and, if a different approach was proposed, a future application would likely be required.
- It was noted that the development would be car free and some members expressed concerns that there might be additional stress on the area that was not covered by a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The Transport Planning Team Manager noted that the site was on the edge of a CPZ but was within the CPZ area and, therefore, there was a policy requirement that the scheme was car free. It was commented that an extension of the CPZ area could be sought. It was added that residents within the development would be restricted from applying for permits in existing or future CPZs.
- In relation to the zinc and concrete cladding proposed, the Principal Urban Design Officer noted that some comparable buildings were visible in the Design and Access Statement. It was explained that the zinc cladding was not a widely used material but was intended to look like a contemporary building and the red colour aimed to echo and respond to some of the surrounding brick houses, such as those on Dagmar Road.
- In relation to play space, the Planning Officer confirmed that this area would be for existing and future residents; this would be gated and would be more secure than the current arrangements.
- The Planning Officer commented that the buildings would be designed to Passivhaus energy efficient standards which would include thicker insulation for external walls, airtightness, and acoustic reduction which would act as a noise barrier. Members raised concerns that the development would be next to a busy train track, including large trains and overnight journeys, and it was enquired whether this had been taken into account as part of the noise report. The Head of Development Management noted that there was a distinction between constant and intermittent noise and it was stated that the conditions had been assessed appropriately. In response to a query about vibrations, it was commented that design elements such as the building façade and insulated windows were intended to mitigate the impact.
- In response to a question about sunlight, the Principal Urban Design Officer noted that all units would have at least dual aspect. It was commented that some units would mainly have morning sunlight but that all units would get sunlight.

- The Planning Officer confirmed that there were no lifts at present but that lifts were proposed in the scheme.
- The Transport Planning Team Manager noted that there were different Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) on the site as the level depended on the distance from interchanges. It was explained that the site had part-3 and part-5 PTAL and was considered to have good public transport accessibility overall.

Cllr Alessandra Rossetti spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the new building would be eight metres higher than the existing building and would be visible from all angles. She considered that the proposal was not in line with the neighbourhood. She added that there were outstanding questions in relation to Council Policies DM1 and DM12 and she did not believe that these had received a response. It was stated that the area was currently subject to congestion and parking difficulties and that the proposal would increase pressure on the area. It was anticipated that an additional 18 cars could be accommodated in the area but that there would be 33 new flats and concerns were expressed about how car ownership by new residents would be monitored. It was accepted that the area had good access to public transport but it was noted that residents might still have cars. Cllr Rossetti said that the construction of the scheme would result in issues for residents in relation to parking suspensions, additional pressure on parking and the road network with large lorries, and building works from 6am-6pm.

It was commented that there were concerns about noise and vibrations for residents and that the proposed mitigations would not be sufficient. It was stated that there would be a significant number of passing trains, including during the night, and it was not considered that there was evidence to show that residents would not be impacted. Cllr Rossetti said that the vibration report noted that additional advice would be sought in the design phase but she was not sure that this had been undertaken. She urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Jack Goulde, Senior Housing Project Manager, stated that the development would replace a vermin-infested area of undercroft parking that had been in disuse for about 25 years and was subject to significant anti-social behaviour. He explained that there had been an 18 month period of engagement with residents of the existing block to design the scheme and it was noted that no planning objections had been received from these residents. In relation to vibrations on the site, it was commented that an assessment had been undertaken over several days which had monitored all trains during the day and night; the vibration calculation was based on sound engineering philosophy and there would be further design development at the next stage of development.

Roy Collado, Architect, commented on some features of the existing building; it was noted that there were no lifts, that residents were not comfortable in using their gardens, and that corridors were dark. In response, the proposals would re-organise the internal circulation and the walkway would be better connected with high quality glazing.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- In response to a query about the modern methods of construction, the applicant team explained that the component parts would be assembled off site and would

then be moved to the site; it was stated that this would use high quality materials and would shorten the build time.

- Members enquired about the hours of operation set out in the Construction Statement, which were 6am-6pm, and the hours of operation set out in the report, which were 8am-6pm. The applicant team noted that this was likely a typographical error and that the hours of operation would be the standard timing for all planning permissions. It was commented that the detail of timings would be agreed as part of the conditions and would be subject to approval from officers.
- It was noted that the afternoon peak times for traffic in the area generally started at 3pm when schools finished; it was enquired whether deliveries could be avoided from 3pm-6pm, rather than 4pm-6pm. It was also asked whether this could be conditioned and whether the reference to 'where possible' could be removed. This was agreed by the Committee.
- It was queried whether deliveries to the site would be possible as the suggested delivery route included some small roads and a large vehicle restriction zone. The applicant team stated that each module of the development would be 3.8 by 4.2 metres and would be accommodated on a conventional truck. It was added that the final delivery routes would meet all planning and highways requirements.
- In response to a query about noise, the applicant team confirmed that the current building was not well insulated and that, with the new buildings, residents would notice a significant improvement.
- In relation to parking pressures, the Transport Planning Team Manager noted that the assessment had compared a 'best case' and 'worst case' scenario, both of which took into account the 18 displaced spaces. In the best case scenario, where cars used five metres to park, there would be an excess of 100 parking spaces and in the worst case scenario, where cars used six metres to park, there would be an excess of 57 parking spaces. It was acknowledged that there was a CPZ in the area and that there was naturally some pressure on parking at the edge of a CPZ; it was noted that residents often campaigned to extend a CPZ if pressures increased and it was highlighted that a car free restriction would apply to current and future CPZs.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum, and with the following amendments:

- To update Condition 13(c)(v) to start the peak time in the afternoon at 3pm and to remove the reference to 'where possible' so that the condition read: Timing of deliveries to and removals from the Plot (to avoid peak times, as agreed with Highways Authority, 07.00 to 9.00 and 15.00 to 18.00).

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, and subject to the amendments above, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the measures set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended measures 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
3. That the measures referred to in resolution (1) above are to be completed no later than 23/12/2022 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following completion of the measures referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions

- 1) Three years
- 2) Drawings
- 3) Materials
- 4) Boundary treatment and access control
- 5) Landscaping
- 6) Lighting
- 7) Site levels
- 8) Secure by design accreditation
- 9) Secure by design certification
- 10) Land contamination
- 11) Unexpected contamination
- 12) NRMM
- 13) Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
- 14) Landscape Ecological Management and Maintenance Plan
- 15) Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- 16) Tree Protection Measures
- 17) Tree Replacement Programme
- 18) Cycle parking
- 19) Construction Logistics Plan
- 20) Satellite antenna
- 21) Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
- 22) Piling Method Statement
- 23) Architect retention
- 24) UKPN
- 25) Energy strategy
- 26) Energy monitoring
- 27) Overheating
- 28) Ecological Enhancement and Ecological Enhancement Measures
- 29) Resident Satisfaction Survey
- 30) Refuse and Waste
- 31) Accessible and Adaptable Units

32)Vibration Assessment

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL Liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Water pressure
- 8) Asbestos
- 9) Secure by design
- 10)Thames Water underground assets
- 11)Water pressure
- 12)Operational Railway
- 13)Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit

Planning obligations:

5. Planning obligations are usually secured through a S106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the local planning authority and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.
6. Several obligations which would ordinarily be secured through a S106 legal agreement will instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.
7. It is recognised that the Council cannot commence to enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing any planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's Housing service and the Planning service, including the resolution of non-compliances with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.
8. The Council cannot impose conditions on planning permission requiring the payment of monies and so the Assistant Director of Housing will confirm in writing before planning permission is granted that the payment of contributions and the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented/occupied.

Heads of Terms:

- General needs low cost rented housing
- Employment and Skills Plan Skills contribution
- Highways works
- TMO
- Travel Plan
- Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution – TBC

- Car Club - a credit of £50 per annum for a period of three years from the Occupation Date in respect of each Residential Unit to the Occupiers of each residential Unit up to a maximum of two
- Carbon Offset Contribution (in case the development does not meet the zero carbon target of reducing carbon emissions by 100% compared to a Part L 2013 Building Regulations notional building)
- Obligations monitoring fee

10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

11. PPA/2022/0020 - LAND ADJACENT TO 341 AND 339 & 341A ('CARA HOUSE'), SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, AND TO THE REAR OF 341 & 343 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the construction of two linked buildings - one of 10 storeys on land adjacent to 341 Seven Sisters Rd and one of 4 storeys to the front of Cara House (Eade Road) both containing ground floor café / workspace uses and Warehouse Living accommodation with associated waste storage and cycle parking; and ten stacked shipping containers to a height of 2 storeys containing workspace / artist uses to the rear of 341 & 343 Seven Sisters Rd with associated toilet facilities, waste storage and cycle parking.

The proposals include landscaping works including the widening and remodelling of the public footpath alongside 341 Seven Sisters Rd and works to Tewksbury Road. And the creation of rain gardens, greening, seating, signage, and artworks and other associated infrastructure works, including the removal of an existing, and the construction of a new, substation.

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

- In relation to the local employment offer, some members enquired whether there would be any priority for local residents and business. The applicant team stated that the scheme would aim to attract people to the area and from the area. It was noted that there was a lot of diversity in the area, including international students and residents, and the applicant team was open to discussion targeted assistance if there was a particular definition or group in mind.
- In response to queries about the levels of air quality and noise, the applicant team noted that they had undertaken air quality and noise assessments which had found the scheme to be compliant. It was stated that the proposals had been designed around Passivhaus energy efficiency principles and would include mechanical ventilation; there would also be an option for residents to open windows but this would not be essential. It was added that the scheme would also provide a buffer for Cara House which did not have the same level of double glazing or ventilation.
- Members enquired about waste removal and the applicant team noted that the commercial units at ground floor level would have their own bin stores which would be subject to a trade waste contract. In relation to household waste, it was

acknowledged that this had been an issue in the area and so improved waste removal had been designed into the proposals.

- In response to a question about cycling improvements, the applicant team acknowledged that some residents required vehicles for work and travel but they stated that they did not wish to provide car parks in the area. They added that they would be happy to contribute to cycling infrastructure.
- Regarding affordability, it was commented that the accommodation was not classified as affordable housing but would be affordable and accessible for young people and would include generous workspaces. The applicant team noted that many warehouse buildings had different landlords which led to varied conditions and investment levels. In this scheme, it was aimed to have more central control and a regulated framework to deal with issues such as fire safety and environmental health standards.

At 9.58pm, the Chair noted that, in accordance with Standing Order 18, the discussion of the specific item or case in hand at 10pm would continue at her discretion and any remaining business would be deferred to a future meeting.

- It was confirmed that the proposal was classified as a tall building.
- Some members noted the difficulties of recreating a warehouse building but queried the design of the proposal. It was stated that the Brutalist design of the side aspect of the building was considered to be excessive and it was suggested that a more artistic design would be welcomed.
- In relation to a query about room sizes, the applicant team stated that the rooms were larger than the London Plan standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and that there were large, communal spaces which were a key feature of warehouse living.
- Some members noted the issues raised by the Quality Review Panel (QRP) and felt that the design was not considered to be acceptable given the location and prominence of the site.
- In response to a question about the ability to maintain the artistic nature of warehouse living, the applicant team explained that they were incorporating positive elements from other buildings but that there was always a mixture of people who lived in the accommodation.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

13. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

14. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 16 January 2023, rather than 9 January 2023.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date