## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2014

Councillors: Ahmet (Chair), Akwasi-Ayisi, Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Carter, Gunes, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Patterson and Rice

| MINUTE<br>NO. | SUBJECT/DECISION  | ACTION<br>BY  |
|---------------|---|---|
| PC32.         | PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS   |   |
|               | This meeting was scheduled to consider pre-application presentations to Planning Sub-Committee and discussion of proposals.   | o the   |
|               | Notwithstanding that this was a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, n were taken at the meeting and any subsequent applications will be the s report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with star procedures.  | ubject of a   |
| PC33.         | COUNCIL HOUSING SITES   |   |
|               | The applications constituted the second phase of the Council new build programme for infill sites across the borough.   | housing   |
|               | <ul> <li>Fenton Road N17 7JQ</li> <li>Confirmation was provided that the area of cladding originally p the ground floor façade of the units had now been removed i matching brickwork.</li> <li>A concern was raised that the 2 bed, 4 person unit did not provid long term flexibility to be considered a family unit. It was requeresponse be sought on this from the Housing Needs and Letting s</li> <li>Discussions were held on the roof form. It was confirmed that chat feasible to the design of the roofs to standardise the pitch to or This would have a degree of visual impact on the adjoining perform the change from a flat to pitched design although fairly minwindows were positioned on the closest flank.</li> <li>It was confirmed that the development would have an impact on the adjacent Compton Crescent properties but was considered following a number of assessments that illustrated required stand be met.</li> <li>Dedicated storage units would be provided within the front curt properties for refuse bins.</li> <li>Concerns were expressed that the dormer windows apped dominant to the design. The architect confirmed that the original incorporated a mansard roof but had been revised to a pitched dormers design following concerns regarding overbearing. The requested that the original mansard design plans be circulated for</li> </ul> | n favour of<br>de sufficient<br>ested that a<br>service.<br>anges were<br>each block.<br>etrol station<br>nimal as no<br>the gardens<br>acceptable<br>dards would<br>ilage of the<br>eared over<br>design had<br>ed roof with<br>e mansard<br>ovided, with<br>Committee |

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2014

|       | ,  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|
|       | <ul> <li>Officers did however emphasise that officers would be required to make the final decision over which roof design to recommend inline with a assessment of the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area.</li> <li>In terms of potential overlooking to the rear including from the balconie confirmation was provided that minimum separation distances wou adhered to.</li> <li>Views were sought on the inclusion of the proposed bungalow unit to the rear. In general, a strong opinion either way was not expressed although the benefit of an extra unit was recognised.</li> <li>Consultation was underway with local residents regarding the potential further resiting of the playground current onsite including seeking feedback on number of option proposed by a landscape architect.</li> </ul> |  |  |
|       | Anderton Court N22 7BE   |  |  |
|       | • The Committee considered that the number and quality of pictures of the proposed design were insufficient to allow them to be commented on and as such, that the application should be deferred to the next pre-application briefing.  |  |  |
|       | <ul> <li>It was advised that there was a degree of conflict in initial views as to<br/>whether the design should be bolder and more contemporary or traditional in<br/>style and which had yet to be resolved.</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|       | Whitbread Close N17 0YB  |  |  |
|       | <ul> <li>A number of concerns were raised over the design including that it did not fit in with the Victorian housing in the area. The architect advised that although the design did not match existing buildings, it was within the context of the area including referencing roof pitches in the vicinity.</li> <li>In response to a question, confirmation was provided that potentially the recessed balconies could be removed should the units be reconfigured into two houses whereby the ground floor amenity space would be sufficient.</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|       | It was requested that all future applications for flat developments coming for<br>Committee for determination include a condition prohibiting the installation of<br>satellite dishes.   |  |  |
| PC34. | FORMER ST ANN'S ROAD POLICE STATION, 289 ST ANN'S ROAD, LONDON, N15 5RD  |  |  |
|       | The Committee provided views on plans to redevelop the former Police Station building for residential use including side and rear extensions, a 4 storey pavilion block and 3 storey mews townhouses.  |  |  |
|       | Officers cautioned that they had yet to consider the design submitted to the Design<br>Panel, or the subsequently revised version incorporating changes to the roof<br>design of the pavilion block in order to set back the accommodation to reduce<br>massing towards the street. Officers had initial concerns that the pavilion block was<br>not subservient to the Police Station building. A determination would need to be<br>made by officers as to whether the proposed design preserved or enhanced the<br>Conservation Area   |  |  |

Cllr Rice requested that the plaque to the ID suite building marked for demolition

Conservation Area.

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2014

|       | from his formal opening of the building when Mayor be returned to him.   |  |
|-------|--|--|
|       | <ul> <li>The Committee raised several concerns over the scheme:</li> <li>The proposed density being in excess of London Plan standards. The applicant advised that they were seeking to optimise the site to secure the refurbishment of the Listed Building and that the density was fairly evenly distributed across the site based on habitable room calculations.</li> <li>Affordable housing. Confirmation was provided that the applicant as a housing association would be seeking to maximise the number of affordable housing units. Confirmation was provided that the existing use value had been paid for the land.</li> <li>The limited proposed parking provision. The applicant advised that the provision had been calculated based on projected demand and provision of a car club in the area. Priority for the spaces would be given to the family units.</li> <li>The visual impact and potential overlooking from corner balconies to the pavilion block. It was advised that private amenity space was sought to all units, only two street fronting balconies were proposed and that consideration would be given to the materials used for the balustrades with respect to enhancing privacy.</li> </ul> |  |
| PC35. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING   |  |
|       | 15 December.   |  |

## COUNCILLOR AHMET

Chair