

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY, 18TH OCTOBER, 2018, 7.00 - 9.50 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Justin Hinchcliffe, Sarah James, Peter Mitchell, Sheila Peacock, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say and Preston Tabois

17. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The meeting was not filmed or recorded.

18. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sarah Williams.

19. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Yvonne Say informed the Chair that she was a Councillor in Bounds Green ward, and had been lobbied by members of the Pinkham Way Alliance. She also advised that in relation to agenda item 8, she was a resident in Tower Gardens.

Councillors Viv Ross and Justin Hinchcliffe also informed the Chair that they had been lobbied by members of the Pinkham Way Alliance.

21. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 5 July 2018 be approved as a correct record.

22. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

The Committee received a deputation from Stephen Brice and Evelyn Ryan of the Pinkham Way Alliance (PWA) in relation to item 7 - North London Waste Plan - Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation.

Mr Brice addressed the Committee and outlined the main issues and concerns of the (PWA). The new report did not provide any history, not did it make it clear that the Regulatory Committee were being asked to comment on a draft report to the Cabinet. The PWA considered the proposal to be a continuing waste of money and referred to previous comments made by inspectors in relation to the removal of the site from the

Council's Site Allocations. Two different consultants had advised that the site was unsuitable and unviable for employment use, and in 2012 an inspector had recommended that the site be reviewed for biodiversity. Mr Brice requested that the Committee kept in mind when considering their comments on the report that the waste plan was 12 years old.

The Committee received a deputation from Stephen Brice and Evelyn Ryan of the Pinkham Way Alliance (PWA) in relation to item 7 - North London Waste Plan - Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation.

Mr Brice addressed the Committee and outlined the main issues and concerns of the (PWA). The new report did not provide any history, not did it make it clear that the Regulatory Committee were being asked to comment on a draft report to the Cabinet. The PWA considered the proposal to be a continuing waste of money and referred to previous comments made by inspectors in relation to the removal of the site from the Council's Site Allocations. Two different consultants had advised that the site was unsuitable and unviable for employment use, and in 2012 an inspector had recommended that the site be reviewed for biodiversity. Mr Brice requested that the Committee kept in mind when considering their comments on the report that the waste plan was 12 years old.

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, responded to the deputation as follows:

"I note your deputation is consistent with the Alliance's previous representations to the Haringey Local Plan and earlier iterations of the North London Waste Plan. I recognise that you disagree with the conclusions that the Council and Planning Inspectors have reached on this site's dual designation. Nevertheless, that is the extant policy position for this site.

As provided for through the plan-making process, the PWA will have the right to make a detailed representation to the proposed site's allocation within the Waste Plan, and to have this considered by an inspector at the "independent examination", having regard to all other available evidence and views.

Whilst I am sorry that you disagree with the inclusion of the Pinkham Way site within the proposed North London Waste Plan, I am of the view that, in order to be open and transparent and arrive at an evidence based conclusion, the most appropriate way forward remains to consult on the plan as submitted.

The site has been identified as having biodiversity value, sufficient to require a Grade 1 Borough SINC designation. It will be for any subsequent planning application to demonstrate that the development proposal will not adversely impact on the biodiversity value of the site or that such impacts can be appropriately mitigated. Officers believe that the two designations are compatible.

The allocation of a site indicates it is proposed for change in use and/or for new development. Because the Council was not proposing any change to the Pinkham

Way site's designations or use, there was no need to include it in the Site Allocations DPD and this is why the Council agreed to remove the site from the Site Allocations DPD. It remains in the Local Plan.

The Council must take into account the views of the landowners, who in the case of Pinkham Way are the North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council, who have confirmed that they wish to see the site retained in its current designation and have further confirmed that they can deliver employment use development on the site without concern for development viability. There is no specific proposal as yet.

The Haringey Employment Land Review identifies that there is significant unmet need for employment land in the borough, and as such preserving this opportunity is considered appropriate. The site is proximate to the A406, and therefore a suitable location for new employment floorspace.

The Pinkham Way site does not provide informal or formal public use or access. It has also not had a history of private open space use, such as other non-public sites included in the Open Space study, such as private playing fields. While owned by various public bodies, the site is managed as a private asset. Finally, the owners of the site argue that designation of the site as Open Space is not deliverable.”

23. NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN - PRE-SUBMISSION (REGULATION 19) CONSULTATION

Philip Crowther, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report as set out. He informed the Committee that there was a range of criteria considered when identifying a site for waste use. It was not proposed that any site be used wholly for waste use – around 20% of the 26 hectares of land identified across the borough would be used for waste use.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- A small part of the Pinkham Way site, around 15%, was in flood zone 2, the rest was in flood zone 1.
- The North London Waste Authority had not put forward a proposal on the type of waste facilities to be provided on site.
- If a site were to be allocated in Haringey, there would be an increase in employment, and of business rates paid to the Council. The Council would also look to secure a proportion of employment in the building and operation of the site for local people.
- On any site where removal of trees was proposed, they would be replanted elsewhere. The Council would always look to secure appropriate mitigation and improve biodiversity where possible.

Councillor Ross proposed that the Regulatory Committee put to the Cabinet that Pinkham Way be removed from the list of identified sites. Councillor Cawley-Harrison seconded the proposal. The Chair moved a vote, and with 6 members in favour and 5 against, it was:

RESOLVED that the report be recommended for consideration at Cabinet, with the request from the Regulatory Committee that Pinkham Way be removed from the list of identified sites.

24. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL AND MANAGEMENT PLANS FOR BRUCE CASTLE, TOTTENHAM CEMETERY, TOWER GARDENS AND PEABODY COTTAGES, AND DRAFT LOCAL HERITAGE LIST

Lucy Morrow, Assistant Planning Officer, introduced the report as set out. The report was seeking comments from the Regulatory Committee before referral to Cabinet for approval to publish four draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan documents and the draft Local Heritage List for a six week public consultation. The rationale for publishing these was for good heritage management, and would help to manage local assets in a coherent and transparent way. The appraisals included a description of the area and a review of the boundaries, and the Heritage List identified buildings of local importance. The Committee were informed that there had been four Haringey owned schools included on the Heritage List, however these had been removed, as all had plans for works in the future.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Descriptions of areas had been provided by consultants – where there were corrections to be made, Ms Morrow would raise these outside of the meeting. The consultants had also made the assessments in relation to the boundaries and whether an area could qualify for statutory designation.
- Members could make suggestions for buildings to be added to the Local Heritage List as part of the consultation.
- The street furniture list would not be updated as there were no new items to be included.

Councillor Bevan proposed that the Committee ask the Cabinet to reconsider the decision to remove Council owned buildings from the Local Heritage List due to concerns over the quality of any future building work. Councillor James seconded the proposal. The Chair moved a vote, and with 11 in favour and one abstention it was:

RESOLVED that the report be recommended for consideration at Cabinet, with the request from the Regulatory Committee that Cabinet reconsider the decision to remove Council owned buildings from the Local Heritage List due to concerns over the quality of any future building work.

25. ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2017/18

Clerks note: Cllr Basu left the meeting at 21.00

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, introduced the report as set out. There was a statutory requirement for the Council to produce an annual report.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The target for building new housing was deliverable from the point of view of granting permissions, the issue was whether the developers built the housing. The Council had objected to a proposal by the Mayor to increase the target.
- Community Infrastructure Levy payments were only made once a scheme had been implemented, and Section 106 payments were made at various points from implementation of permission until completion. There were no issues with the service collecting s106 or CIL payments, but the service could only collect money from applications that had been implemented. Works had started or completed on around 5000 units.
- There were specific areas where s106 money could be spent, and the service were making efforts to raise awareness with other services in the Council to encourage bids for funding from the s106 funds.

RESOLVED that the report be noted and referred to Cabinet for consideration.

26. PLANNING SERVICES 2018/19 (APRIL - SEPTEMBER) UPDATE

Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, introduced the report as set out. To date, 1770 planning applications had been made which was an increase of 46 applications compared to the same period in 2017/18. There had been 42 appeals, 29 of which had been won, which was on average with other London boroughs. The service was currently the best performing service in London, with 100% performance on major applications and 98% performance on minor applications. The pre-application advice service was providing a key income stream for the department.

Bob McIver, Head of Building Control Services, updated the Committee on Building Control. 515 fee earning applications had been received to date, which was an increase compared to previous years. Site inspections had increased by 20%. The Hackett review had made 53 recommendations, and an action plan put in place. There were a number of things that would need to be implemented, and an update would be provided at a later date to the Committee.

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, advised the Committee that currently there was a consultation running asking for priorities for the spend of the neighbourhood element of Community Infrastructure Levy funds.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

27. HARINGEY ENFORCEMENT PLAN

Emma Williamson, Assistant Director for Planning, advised the Committee that she had not received any comments from members since the report was provided at the

last Committee meeting. Cllr Mitchell agreed to provide comments separately after the meeting.

RESOLVED that the Enforcement Plan be noted.

28. NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS - INFORMATION ITEM

The Committee noted the item.

29. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

30. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Noted the dates of future meetings.

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair

Date