

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, 28th January, 2016, 7pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), David Beacham, John Bevan, Clive Carter, Toni Mallett, James Patterson, James Ryan, Elin Weston and Reg Rice**

### **8. FILMING AT MEETINGS RESOLVED**

- That the Chair's announcement regarding the filming of the meeting for live or subsequent broadcast be noted.

### **9. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Basu, Carroll and Doron. Cllr Rice substituted.

### **10. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Bevan identified in relation to item 9, Land at Hale Wharf Ferry Lane N17 9NF, that he sat on the Lee Valley Park Board which was adjacent to the site.

The Committee's Legal Officer identified that the interest declared above would, inline with the Council's constitution, ordinarily constitute a prejudicial interest. Once the full application came before the Committee for determination, he advised that it would be appropriate for Cllr Bevan to recuse himself for that item. Cllr Bevan noted this advice.

### **11. MINUTES RESOLVED**

- That the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 1 December be approved.

### **12. PARK ROAD SWIMMING POOLS PARK ROAD N8 7JN**

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

### **13. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS**

The following items were pre-application presentations to the Planning Sub-Committee and discussion of proposals related thereto.

Notwithstanding that this was a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no decisions were taken on these items, and any subsequent applications would be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with standard procedures.

### **14. LAND AT HALE WHARF FERRY LANE N17 9NF**

Early design plans had been considered twice by the Quality Review Panel (QRP) to broad support save for the provision of additional details on the roofscape and public spaces. A copy of the Panel's comments was circulated to the Committee.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion of the proposal:

- Concern was raised over the management of future flood risks being that the site was located in a 3a Flood Zone (high probability). The applicant advised that the surrounding waters, the River Lee Navigation Channel and Flood Relief Channel, were classified as controlled waters, controlled both up and down stream, thereby reducing the risk. Discussions on flooding were however ongoing with the Environment Agency although it had not currently been flagged as a significant issue.
- Clarification was sought on the selection of the location for the tall residential tower. The applicant explained that the southern end of the site was a more appropriate siting for a tall building because of the vistas, the open area around the lock and public realm and avoidance of the environmental issues related to the Paddock to the northern end.
- Clarification was sought on plans for the provision of family size housing. The applicant confirmed approximately 50 three plus bedroom units would be located to the north east of the site.
- The views of the QRP were queried with particular regard to ensuring high design quality of the tall residential tower. Officers advised that the QRP were generally supportive of the proposed siting of a tall building on the development site but that as the application was at an early stage, consideration had yet to be given to detailed material plans. The full application would be reconsidered by the QRP at that stage. The Committee requested that the feedback provided by the Panel be listed within the final officer report when the application was brought back for determination alongside an officer response to each point.
- Clarification was sought on the provision of green roofs. It was advised that around a third of residential units would have green roofs, primarily those overlooking the Paddock.
- An early indication was sought from the applicant on the potential affordable housing contribution to be put forward for the scheme. The applicant advised that assessments were at an early stage, with an independent viability report to be produced following a land values benchmarking exercise. Consultation would also be undertaken with the Council's housing service relating to proposed housing mix and with potential registered housing providers.
- Clarification was sought on the design of balconies to the tower. The applicant advised that balcony detailing had yet to be developed but that generally projecting balconies were considered acceptable to lower storeys, potentially converting to recessed balconies for the higher storeys.
- Concerns were expressed over the scheme exacerbating existing pressures on GP services and demand for primary school places in the area. The applicant confirmed that a full impact assessment of the development on education and healthcare provision would be undertaken, including discussions with the owners of the Hale Village scheme. Officers advised that a separate piece of work, the Tottenham Area Action Plan, was being undertaken by the Council to look at health and educational needs over the wider area and the potential use of CIL funds as well as contributions from developers towards extending provision.

- Further information was sought on proposed parking arrangements for the scheme. Confirmation was provided that the scheme would include some parking provision, with priority given to the larger and disabled access residential units. A low parking solution was anticipated however in reflection of the good public transport links to the site.
- Further information was sought on consideration of the provision of dedicated cycle routes or bike hangers for the scheme, with the site being located in an area ideal for recreational cycling. The applicant advised that discussions were ongoing with the GLA on potentially connecting into LB Waltham Forest's mini Holland scheme to the east of the site at Ferry Lane. The scheme would fully comply with London Plan standards in relation to cycling provision.
- The Committee requested that the full application include an assessment of the impact of the scheme on local transport infrastructure.

The applicant's projected submission date for the final application was end April/May.

#### **15. 45-63 & 67 LAWRENCE ROAD N15 4EN**

The overall development consisted of two separate schemes covering two separate sites both working to the same masterplan to bring forward two concurrent planning applications.

The applicant confirmed that a response would be provided to the QRP regarding their comments.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion of the proposal:

- Comments were put forward that the design was too rectilinear in form; that there was no uniformity in design between the schemes or the nearby Lawrence Road Bellway scheme; and that the mix of materials and finishes proposed was uncoordinated. It was noted that the QRP had suggested greater co-ordination of materials across the two sites.
- In response to a question seeking an early indication on affordable housing contributions for the schemes, the applicants confirmed that discussions were at an early stage and would be supported by two separate viability assessments and contributions. The Committee expressed concern that splitting the site into two separate applications was a tactic to reduce the affordable housing contributions due. The applicants advised that originally the developers had sought to bring forward two separate schemes but had eventually agreed to the benefits of brokering a common, cohesive approach. Both schemes remained large in terms of size.
- Details were sought on the land owned by the Council on the development site. Officers advised that the Council/Homes for Haringey owned a small strip of land used as amenity space to the west of the site and which would be sold to the applicants for retention as green space.

The applicant's projected submission date for the final application was end March.

#### **16. HAWES AND CURTIS, 584 GREEN LANES, N8 0RA**

The proposal had been to the QRP who had identified issues with the frontage and massing to Green Lanes.

The applicant advised that discussions were ongoing with the NHS regarding plans for the provision of a health centre onsite.

The Committee raised the following points in discussion of the proposal:

- Concern were expressed that the ability to comment on the scheme was limited due to the very early stage of the plans and that greater consistency was required in plans coming before the Committee at pre-application stage. Officers agreed to look into how improvements could be made going forward set within the context of the infrequency of meetings and variation in the speed of progress of applications.
- Landscaping plans for the front of the site were questioned, particularly as historically mature trees had been in place. The applicant affirmed aspirations to plant mature trees to the Green Lanes frontage.
- The Committee emphasised the importance of the comments of the QRP being taken into account to ensure delivery of a high quality scheme. The applicant noted this and advised that this had yet to be actioned due to time constraints from the pre-app meeting schedule. The Committee also emphasised the importance of an affordable housing contribution coming forward as part of the application. The applicant outlined that the determination of this contribution linked into viability would be dependent on confirmation with the NHS on the proposed floorspace of the health centre onsite and which would constitute a significant cost to the scheme.
- Clarification was sought on the relationship between the scheme and the new consented development at Colina Mews. Officers advised that there were a number of windows overlooking the proposal site but that the scheme would be set away to mitigate overlooking and overshadowing.
- In response to a question, the applicant confirmed that discussions were ongoing with London Underground regarding future management of the Tube air shaft located on the site.
- Concerns were expressed over the potential for the development to exacerbate existing traffic and parking problems in the area. The applicant advised that priority for parking provision would be given to disabled residents but that the site was located in an area of good transport accessibility.

The applicant's projected submission date for the final application was April.

**17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 8 February.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....