

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 10TH OCTOBER, 2022, 7.00 - 9.50 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett (from item 9), Councillor Cathy Brennan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor George Dunstall, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Yvonne Say, and Councillor Matt White.

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 Alexandra Worrell. 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. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 4 July 2022, 11 July 2022, and 21 July 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2022/0823 - BROADWATER FARM ESTATE, N17

The Committee considered an application for the 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 Head of Development Management informed the Committee that, as set out in paragraph 3.21 of the report, the Department for Digital, Culture, Media, and Sport was considering listing the mural attached to the Tangmere block. As set out in the addendum, the mural attached to the Tangmere block had now been Grade II listed and the officer recommendation had been revised to recommend that this item was deferred to allow consideration of the impact of the proposal on this heritage asset and submission of an application for Listed Building Consent.

The Chair noted that the mural attached to Tangmere block had now been Grade II listed and the officer recommendation had been amended to defer, as set out in the addendum. As a result, the Chair moved to defer the application to provide additional time to consider and address the material change in circumstances arising from the recent listing of the mosaic mural on the Tangmere building. This was seconded by Cllr Say.

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

RESOLVED

To defer the decision to provide additional time to consider and address the material change in circumstances arising from the recent listing of the mosaic mural on the Tangmere building.

Cllr Bartlett joined the meeting at 7.10pm.

9. HGY/2022/ 0967 - 313 THE ROUNDWAY AND 8-12 CHURCH LANE, N17 7AB

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new Class E/ F1 floorspace at ground floor and residential C3 units with landscaping and associated works.

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

- Some members noted that the scheme would provide 21% affordable housing, which was not in line with the Haringey or Londonwide targets, and asked how this

was being balanced as reasonable. It was explained that the affordable housing target in policy terms was 40% for Haringey and 35% for the Greater London Authority (GLA). In cases where a scheme did not meet this level, a viability assessment was required as supporting evidence. It was noted that officers tried to maximise affordable housing but that it was not always possible to meet targets. In this case, it was stated that there had been an appraisal and an independent review which demonstrated that the scheme was in deficit and could not meet the targets.

- In relation to highway safety, it was noted that the Transport Officer had originally objected to the application, including detrimental impacts on cycling infrastructure and safety. In the addendum to the report, it was clarified that the Transport Officer still objected on the basis of blue badge parking provision but that the impact on cyclists was now considered to be neutral following some changes from the applicant. The Transport Planning Team Manager added that, as part of the section 278 highways agreement, officers would also be seeking to secure enhancements rather than a neutral impact.
- Some members asked about how the proposal would enhance the setting of the conservation area and noted that the Conservation Officer had described the plans as 'visually intrusive' in parts. The Planning Officer explained that it was necessary to weigh all impacts as a whole. It was considered that the impact of the proposal was limited enough that it was offset by the other benefits of the scheme.
- Some members enquired whether it was possible to improve the children's play area near the site or to make a contribution to Bruce Castle Park instead of provision within the site. The Head of Development Management explained that the policy position was to provide playspace on site in the first instance. It was noted that, as there was no shortfall in provision, officers were not in a position to ask for more. It was commented that contributions to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could go towards park improvements.
- In response to a question about why carbon emissions could not be reduced by more than 60%, the Planning Officer explained that officers tried to maximise carbon reductions as much as possible but that there were sometimes constraints relating to the site layout and other factors.
- It was confirmed that there was no Construction Management Plan (CMP) at present. It was explained that a contractor had not yet been appointed but that they would be required to submit a CMP under Condition 14. In response to a question from the Committee, it was stated that officers would seek to ensure that vehicular movements would be taken outside of school start and finish times as much as possible.
- It was clarified that the viability appraisal from the applicant had been undertaken before the CIL figures had been revised by the Council. It was explained that CIL had been £15/sqm and was now £50/sqm and that the scheme, which had initially had a small surplus, now had a deficit. Some councillors highlighted the importance of including the detail of viability assessments in the report to the Committee.
- The Committee asked about the Transport Officer objection on the basis of blue badge parking provision and whether the surplus or the Council's policy on blue badge reservations could apply to resolve the objection. The Planning Officer explained that the Council's policy on blue badge reservations could address the issue in practice but that this would not resolve the objection as this did not fall under on site provision and was outside the planning process.

- Some members acknowledged that there was a 40% boroughwide target for affordable housing but commented that policy SP2 required sites capable of delivering 10 units or more to meet 40%. The Head of Development Management highlighted that the boroughwide target for affordable housing was 40%, subject to the viability on site. It was explained that, in this case, the evidence demonstrated that the maximum, reasonable amount was below 40%. It was noted that the policy aimed to optimise affordable housing but this did not require maximisation at all costs. It was explained that, in some cases, the target of 40% could be applied over multiple sites; for example, this had been applied in Tottenham Hale previously.
- Some members enquired whether samples of materials could be provided. The Head of Development Management noted that samples could be requested for the Committee to view but that this was only in exceptional cases where the materials were considered to be critical. It was also explained that the details of materials were usually confirmed later in the process and were not generally decided at this point. It was added that the materials would be scrutinised by the Design and Conservation Officers.
- It was confirmed that the requirement for acoustic hoarding, which aimed to minimise the impact on Bruce Castle Museum and the local area, would be included in the detail of the conditions.
- Some members enquired about the level of affordable housing and the acceptability of the proposal on this basis. The Head of Development Management noted that the Committee should assess whether the development provided the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing, bearing in mind the evidence provided in relation to viability. It was explained that the level of development had been suppressed in this case due to the proximity to and impact of the scheme on a Grade I Listed building. It was acknowledged that the Committee could take a different view on whether additional heritage impact was acceptable.
- The Head of Development Management commented that the policy on optimising development was set out in the London Plan and focused on design reviews. In this case, reviews had been undertaken by Quality Review Panel (QRPs) who had commented that the development sat comfortably in its context and was considered to be the right scale for the site.
- The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that, if the scheme provided additional affordable housing, it was unlikely to meet the heritage aims set out in policy. It was explained that there was always likely to be a balance and a judgement on planning considerations. It was noted that affordability had been independently reviewed and scrutinised by officers and it was considered that all the relevant information had been provided; it was highlighted that page 131 of the agenda papers covered issues of affordable housing in detail.

Cllr White moved to defer consideration of the planning application to allow additional information in relation to and additional time to consider affordable housing and how the balance between affordable housing and other planning considerations was calculated in this case. The Head of Development Management noted that there was a significant amount of background information and the Committee report summarised the outcomes of this; to defer or reach an alternative conclusion, the Committee would need to satisfy itself that an additional storey would be acceptable on the site. As it was not seconded, the motion was not passed.

Carol Hebbs, Friends of Bruce Castle and Haringey Heritage Ambassador, spoke in objection to the application. She explained that the Friends of Bruce Castle did not object to development on the site but did object to the proposal in terms of height, design quality, and impact on nearby heritage assets. She stated that the site was located in the Bruce Castle Conservation Area and close to a number of heritage assets, including the Bruce Castle Museum and Tower, which were Grade I Listed, the wall between the Museum and Tower and the site, which was Grade II Listed, and the wall to the south of the site, which was Grade II Listed and on the heritage at risk register. It was added that there were over 20 Listed Buildings on Bruce Grove Road approaching the site, that it was an archaeological priority area, and that it was a site of importance for nature conservation.

Carol Hebbs said that, although the Conservation Officer did not object to the proposal in principle, she believed that parts of the report seemed to be critical of the development and contradictory. She felt that the proposals should enhance Bruce Castle, including access to Bruce Castle Park. She noted that the development guidelines stated that building height should be limited to the level of the adjacent nursery and the existing houses to the north of the site, in addition to recognising the importance of Bruce Castle Park. It was commented that there was no discussion of the impact of the scheme on the museum which had been operational for 160 years. It was considered that the five storey building would block light which would affect the ability to use and to continue improvements on the courtyard. It was noted that the guidelines stated that there was an opportunity to create a visual, architectural landmark and act as a wayfinder to nearby heritage assets; it was contended that Bruce Castle was an existing wayfinder that would be overshadowed by redevelopment.

Cllr Sue Jameson spoke in objection to the application. She noted that other councillors had raised some of her concerns already. She added that overcrowding was a significant local issue and she believed that none of the three bed units proposed would be offered as affordable housing. The Planning Officer clarified that affordable housing was proposed. Cllr Jameson expressed concerns that the amount of affordable housing was being taken on trust and stated that it was important to ensure that the maximum level of affordable housing was provided.

Cllr Ibrahim Ali spoke in objection to the application and explained that there was a strength of feeling locally. He stated that there were a number of Listed assets in the ward which attracted visitors to the area, including a high number of visitors to Bruce Castle Museum. He felt that the proposal would affect the ability of the museum to raise funds. He said that a scheme of this height would open up any brownfield site in the conservation area to higher and more dense developments which was considered to be unfortunate as the area had been largely unchanged for decades. It was noted that it was important to preserve heritage assets. Cllr Ali stated that the nearby wall was Grade II Listed and was on the heritage at risk register; there were concerns that the impact of development on the wall had not been fully considered and that the Council would be financially liable for any damage to wall. Cllr Ali also expressed concerns that there would be no social housing, that there had been no traffic surveys, and that the new east to west pedestrian route did not recognise the existing route on All Hallows Road and would bring anti-social behavioural issues into the new east-

west route, which was a residential area. It was acknowledged that there was no objection from Historic England but it was considered that the proposal would have significant historical and financial consequences and would not address the housing crisis.

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

- In response to a question about heritage harm, Carol Hebbs stated that the impact on heritage was mainly through blocking views of and from the existing buildings. It was acknowledged that Heritage England had deferred the decision but this did not mean that they had no opinion. In terms of the physical impact, it was noted that the lane was narrow and that the wall at risk was in very close proximity to the development. It was highlighted that, if there was any damage, it would require a considerable amount of money to fix the wall and it could be irreplaceable.
- In relation to a query about balancing the heritage impact and the need for housing, Cllr Ali suggested that the applicant could have spent more time negotiating with other site owners; he was not convinced that petrol station use would decline in future years as set out in some of the scheme documentation. He said that he was not against development but felt that the proposal should not overshadow the nearby heritage assets. It was added that the museum was a key site that should be taken into account and Cllr Ali felt that many uses on site, such as weddings and events, would reduce if the proposal was agreed; this would also have a financial impact as the museum would have to rely more on council support.
- In response to a question about heritage impact, the Conservation Officer explained that both the direct, material impact and the visual impact were considered. Overall, the Conservation Officer considered that the scheme would have a limited impact in material terms. It was noted that the boundary walls were quite fragile assets and were on the heritage at risk register due to deteriorating brickwork; however, there were no issues of foundation damage or subsidence so it was not considered that the new development would impact on structural issues. It was explained that all developments started by attempting to maximise the quantum of housing and that the Conservation Officer would discuss and clarify the constraints and opportunities for a site. It was acknowledged that the scheme would have an impact but noted that any development would result in some impact and that this did not mean that it was intrinsically wrong or did not respond to the needs of the community. It was highlighted that, for the current scheme, there had been numerous efforts to mitigate the impact of the scheme to be respectful of the distinctive and historical buildings; this had been carefully assessed and the height, mass, bulk, and visual impact were considered to be a realistic compromise.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Chris Horn, Chris Horn Associates, noted that the site was located amongst a number of high quality assets. He said that the applicant had been aware from the outset that there would be a need to balance the development with this and had sought to bring forward the scheme with maximal benefits and as sympathetically as possible. It was noted that there had been a gradual reduction in the scale of the scheme, that views had been tested, and that significant work had been done with a heritage specialist who had reported back to the Council and Heritage England. Chris Horn commented that Heritage England had

been very involved, particularly with Bruce Castle which was a Grade I Listed asset, and that the applicant had been relieved when the scheme had been deferred for local decision as it was considered to be small enough that there would not be a significant, negative impact. The applicant believed that the scheme made the maximum contribution possible and would bring a derelict site into full use, including works to improve the appearance of and movement around Church Lane. It was added that the applicant was aiming for high standards of design, following two rounds of input from the Quality Review Panel (QRP), and ambitious carbon reductions.

Chris Horn acknowledged that the wall between the site and the Museum/ Tower was Listed and noted that the applicant would undertake a full survey, as required by condition, before the commencement of any works on the ground. The applicant believed that the scheme would provide a 21st century contribution to the area. It was noted that the previous scheme from 2006 was less tenable and did not include the level of land area that the current applicant had assembled. The applicant considered that the current scheme provided a working solution for the site and would make a positive and lasting contribution.

Holly Mitchell, Simply Planning, stated that the applicant had tried to achieve optimisation, rather than maximisation, on the site. This meant aiming for the amount of housing that the site could accommodate in its context without having an excessive impact. It was explained that the applicant had taken a design-led approach to find the most appropriate scheme; this had involved challenge from Design and Heritage Officers, design team meetings, and input from the QRP. It was added that viewpoints had been selected, tested, and refined and the level of affordable housing had been assessed based on all considerations, including build costs, viability, and CIL levels.

Chris Horn noted that the Committee had commented on the possibility of upgrading the children's play area and garden. He explained that the scheme would include a CIL payment of over £300,000 and the applicant would support the use of funds to improve those areas.

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

- It was noted that the initial design had sought to meet affordable housing expectations. It had started at 11 storeys but the applicant had quickly determined that this would be unworkable with prominent and sensitive views. The applicant had spread the mass around the site, including the incorporation of commercial uses. It was commented that the site had a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5; this would typically be expected to contain a large building but the current, smaller proposal was a consequence of heritage considerations. The advice to the applicant had been that any proposal larger than the existing scheme would have received significant objections.
- Some members enquired whether social housing had been considered. The applicant team stated that a balance of tenure types would be offered and that this would include a mixture of affordable rent and shared ownership units.
- Some members of the Committee noted that it was positive to see a scheme with alternative affordable provision and asked whether the Council would have a first option to purchase any of the units and whether this would be at market rate. Chris Horn stated that the applicant would be happy to work with the Council as there was likely a mutual benefit from this arrangement. It was noted that the choice of

how to allocate the value derived from the scheme would be an issue for the Council.

- It was confirmed that the east to west route through the site would be closed at night. Although site permeability was beneficial, it was considered that closing this route at night would have safety benefits; it was noted that the opening and closing times could be extended if required.
- In relation to a query about blue badge parking, the applicant team volunteered to permanently exclude residents from applying for permits for any future CPZs; the development had been designed and would be marketed as car free.
- The applicant team noted that they had assembled as much land in the area as possible but, in areas where this had not been possible, provision had been made in the treatment of flank walls which would allow the development of the other sites as natural continuations if they could be obtained in the future.
- It was noted that approximately half of the space in front of the development would have some greening which would provide some protection from noise and pollution; it was enquired whether additional planting could be included to provide screening for the other half of the development. It was also asked whether there could be additional Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) measures in this area. Holly Mitchell noted that the pavements at the front of the development were over 10 metres wide and were in TfL ownership. The applicant's approach had been to protect the trees and roots and it was also hoped to agree additional planting and SUDS as part of the Section 278 agreement. It was clarified that there was an intention to do works on these areas which were within the red line of the development but that delivery would require agreement from TfL. Holly Mitchell noted that TfL had agreed in principle but this would be subject to final detail and agreement. In relation to noise and pollution protection, it was noted that there would be inset balconies in this area to protect residents.
- The Planning Officer commented that there were some existing SUDS proposed in the form of green and brown roofs on buildings and attenuation tanks to help to retain and slow the transfer of water.
- In relation to blue badge parking, it was noted that the preference of the Transport Officer was to have provision on site; this would be in the garden area on Church Lane but the applicant team explained that they had worked hard to maintain this as a green area which was considered important for the setting of the site. The applicant wished to provide blue badge parking on the street and it was added that there would be mobility scooter parking and charging on the site.
- In relation to brickwork, it was confirmed that this would be secured by condition and would include material samples.
- In response to a query from the Committee, it was confirmed that the proposed, new, east to west route would be open to bicycles.
- Cllr Cawley-Harrison asked to include some informatives and conditions based on the Committee's discussions and the applicant's responses. In relation to the development being car free, it was asked whether residents could also be excluded from future CPZs. It was asked that any people moving into accessible homes on the site were informed that the Council offered a permitting system for exclusive use of blue badge bays. Additionally, it was requested that TfL was informed that, if the green space was redesigned in any way, the Council would encourage the inclusion of SUDS.

- It was noted that the Highways Officer had made a comment that there would be an agreement that the width of Church Lane would not be reduced but that there may be some realignment; it was enquired whether this would be secured by condition. The Head of Development Management explained that the arrangements for Church Lane would be subject to a section 278 agreement which would include a road safety audit.

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:

- Additional Head of Term: to restrict residents from obtaining permits for any future CPZs.
- Additional Condition: in relation to the impact on the Listed wall, to include an additional condition on impact from foundation design and to ensure that the commitments made on piling were secured.
- Additional Informative: occupants advised about the option to apply for exclusive use of blue badge parking bays.
- Additional Informative: to request that any works on TfL land should seek to include SUDS.

Cllr White moved to reject the application on the basis that the application did not satisfy policies SP2 and DM13 of the Local Plan as it required more affordable housing than was proposed. He also noted that the scheme did not comply with policy H5 of the London Plan which asked for a minimum of 35% affordable housing. Cllr White acknowledged the officer view that the optimum balance had been struck between the heritage impact and affordable housing but was not satisfied that this was the case, particularly because the application proposed would still have a heritage impact. In addition, Cllr White noted the Transport Officer comments that the scheme would have a neutral impact on highway safety but suggested that this did not comply with policies DM31 and SP7 of the Local Plan and LPT1 and 2 of the London Plan which asked for developments to improve the cycling environment. In relation to both affordable housing and highway safety, Cllr White believed that the aesthetic criteria were outweighing the physical safety and material wellbeing of residents and was not satisfied that the balance had been struck correctly. This was seconded by Cllr Ovat.

The Head of Development Management advised that there was no evidence that it was viable to provide more affordable housing and there was a very high risk of being unable to defend this ground for refusal at appeal; it was advised that this ground of appeal was not taken forward. In relation to the issue of optimum balance, it was noted that this was more of a matter of judgement. It was commented that the Committee should also bear in mind that there were some benefits in terms of cycling and that the finding of a neutral impact was a balance of positives and negatives.

The Head of Development Management asked Cllr White for further clarity on what was meant by the aesthetic impact being weighed against safety, in order to advise whether there was merit in this ground. Cllr White drew attention to paragraph 6.147 of the report which stated that the Transport Officer objected based on a potential reduction in highway safety but that this was considered to be outweighed by significant benefits relating to visual appearance. Cllr White commented that this appeared to weigh aesthetic criteria more strongly than the safety of road users. The Head of Development Management advised that the position of the Transport Officer

had changed, as set out in the addendum, and that there were not considered to be any safety issues. It was added that there were two, separate impacts on the two sides of the development: the greening impact on the Roundway side of the development and the impact on the Cycle Superhighway on the eastern side. It was noted that there was not a trade-off between these two elements but the officer was noting some benefits and disadvantages. It was highlighted that the reason for refusal would need to be substantiated based on the final position of the Transport Officer.

The Head of Development Management stated that a reason for refusal based on the proposal not providing improvements would need to weigh the benefits and disadvantages and consider that the benefits were insufficient to satisfy the policy that asks for improvements. Cllr White stated that his motion in relation to transport was that the London Plan and the Haringey Local Plan asked for improvements and it was not considered that the development would provide this. The Head of Development Management noted that there was some merit in this if the Committee was satisfied that there was planning harm. It was commented that not every site could enhance an area and that the reason for refusal may need to be strengthened.

With 2 votes for, 7 votes against, and 1 abstention, the motion was not passed.

Following a vote with 6 votes in favour, 2 votes against, and 2 abstentions, 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 appropriate conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 30th November 2021 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability 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
4. That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability/Head of Development Management to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of the report)

- 1) Three years to commence
- 2) Drawing numbers
- 3) Use Classes
- 4) Materials
- 5) Roof plant details
- 6) Secured by design
- 7) Lighting
- 8) Ecology
- 9) Landscaping
- 10) Cycle parking
- 11) Deliveries and servicing
- 12) Contamination
- 13) Remediation
- 14) CEMP
- 15) Piling
- 16) Fire strategy
- 17) Air quality assessment
- 18) Play space
- 19) Digital connectivity
- 20) Arboricultural method statement
- 21) Highway condition survey
- 22) Route access controls
- 23) Block D access controls
- 24) Boundary treatments
- 25) RSA Stage 2
- 26) Energy strategy
- 27) DEN connection
- 28) Energy monitoring
- 29) Overheating – residential
- 30) Overheating – non-residential
- 31) Building user guide
- 32) BREEAM
- 33) Living roofs
- 34) Surface water drainage
- 35) Drainage management
- 36) Wheelchair user dwellings
- 37) Television antenna/satellite dish
- 38) Plant noise
- 39) Considerate contractor
- 40) **In relation to the impact on the Listed wall, to include an additional condition on impact from foundation design and to ensure that the commitments made on piling were secured**

Informatives

- 1) Proactive relationship
- 2) CIL
- 3) Signage
- 4) Naming and numbering
- 5) Asbestos survey

- 6) Water pressure
- 7) Designing out crime
- 8) Environmental permit
- 9) Noise levels
- 10) **Occupants will be advised of the option to apply for exclusive use of blue badge parking bays**
- 11) **Any works on TfL land should seek to include Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)**

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

- 1) Affordable housing
 - 21% by habitable room
 - 8 affordable rented homes
 - 5 shared ownership homes
 - Early-stage review if no work commenced within two years
 - Late-stage review
- 2) Car club contributions
 - Each new dwelling to be provided with a contribution of max. £100 per unit towards use of a car club
- 3) Travel plans
 - Residential travel plan
 - Workspace travel plan
 - Monitoring costs at £1,000 per travel plan per year for five years (£10,000)
- 4) Electric vehicle charging
 - One active EV charging point provided to an off-site parking space
 - Remainder of parking spaces to be fitted with 'passive' EV provision
- 5) Highway works to be secured through a s278 agreement **(in consultation with Transport for London)**
 - **Works shall include relocation of variable message sign on The Roundway, if required**
- 6) Wayfinding strategy
 - Details of signage on and to the new east-west route
- 7) New public route through the site
 - Management and maintenance arrangements
- 8) Architect retention
- 9) Employment and skills plan
 - **Including a contribution towards employment and skills initiatives of £34,400**
- 10) Carbon offsetting £91,171.50
 - Energy strategy review on occupation

- Final offsetting figure can then be reviewed
- 10% management fee also required

11)Monitoring

- 5% of total financial heads (excluding carbon offset)
- £500 per non-financial head
- Estimated **£5,720**

12)Council to have first option to purchase the proposed affordable housing

13)To exclude residents from obtaining permits from any future Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)

5. In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.
6. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above 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. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM13 of the Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP2 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy H4 of the London Plan.
 2. 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.
 3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SI2 of the London Plan, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD 2017.
 4. 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.
 5. 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,

Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.

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 within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
 - iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

At 9pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment. The meeting resumed at 9.05pm.

10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

11. PPA/2022/0017 - OSBORNE GROVE NURSING HOME / STROUD GREEN CLINIC, 14-16 UPPER TOLLINGTON PARK, LONDON, N4 3EL

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the Site to provide circa 70 nursing home beds, 10 nursing studios for homelessness end of life and 20 sheltered housing flats (Extra Care Flats). Proposals will also include a Day Centre for use of the residents and the wider community as part of a facility to promote ageing wellness.

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

- The applicant team noted that there was an existing health centre on site which was delivered by an external provider and was commissioned across five boroughs in North Central London. It was explained that they were looking for an alternative site in Haringey but that the services could be provided across the wider area if required. Emily Snelling, Supported Accommodation Development Lead, stated that keeping the services had been considered but it was highlighted that the site did not provide some key features that had been identified as part of the codesign process, such as connections to amenities and the local community.
- In relation to trees, it was proposed to remove two mature sycamore trees and a maple tree. It was stated that the sycamore trees were in bad condition and were located across this site and the neighbouring site. In order to provide secure

boundary fencing and improve the site, it was proposed to remove the trees and have planting in more appropriate positions. The applicant team explained that the maple tree located at the front of the building was damaging the foundations and external wall. It was noted that moving the entrance had been considered in order to keep the tree but that this would require pushing back the building by 5 metres and including another recess; it was considered that this would negatively impact the street frontage and the relationship with the neighbouring terraced housing. It had been agreed with the Tree Officer that the best course of action would be to plant semi-mature trees around the site and in better locations which would also assist with screening and general appearance.

- The applicant team stated that off-site construction would be undertaken for the proposal and this was aimed to reduce noise, vibrations, dust, waste, and material storage on site which were often issues with construction, particularly on a small site such as this one.
- In response to a question about whether the development would be fully car free, the applicant team confirmed that there would be four, blue badge parking spaces. It was explained that the development was not designed to use regular parking but that there may be instances where these spaces were required at short notice; the proposal was designed to be a practical balance.
- The Committee heard that 8-12 beds per household was considered to be the premium number and the proposal would provide 10 beds per household. It was noted that the communal facilities would be sited at the centre of households, only 8 metres away from the central area; this would encourage independence and movement and the layout would also provide improved lines of sight for nursing staff.
- In relation to the design of the building compared to the surrounding area, the applicant team noted that the proposed building line was located on what was thought to be the historic building line and was only 2 metres forward of the neighbouring terraces. It was explained that the design had been carefully considered with the Conservation Officer to provide the best quality design that was not pastiche but complimented the surrounding area. The applicant team considered that the proposed proportions matched the rhythm of the street.
- It was acknowledged that the building was designed to facilitate residential, short term stays but it was explained that a number of key features in the building were not appropriate, such as the provision of en suite toilets rather than full bathrooms. It was noted that additional detail was included in the report to the Council's Cabinet in 2019.
- It was noted that the facility would have a mix of residents and that it was aimed to create an innovative unit which would provide nursing care but would be designed to reflect the needs of individuals and provide appropriate placements. It was explained that there were often shortages of placements for those with specific Dementias, those with Learning Difficulties, and Homeless households who often had complex issues.
- It was added that the outside spaces would be open to all residents, with the exception of those in the homelessness unit who would have their own space and would be more likely to go outside the facility. It was noted that there would be a mixture of areas, including quiet spaces and some spaces with exercise functions.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The Chair noted that any further queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

13. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Chair noted that any further 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 7 November 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date