

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