

# **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 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 .....