

# **MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 7TH OCTOBER, 2019, 7.00 - 9.58 PM**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Preston Tabois, Sarah Williams and Liz Morris**

### **360. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Noted.

### **361. PLANNING PROTOCOL**

Noted.

### **362. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adamou and Hinchcliffe.

Councillor Morris was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Hinchcliffe.

### **363. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **364. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

### **365. MINUTES**

Members commented that some of the conditions raised as part of the discussion were not included in the minutes of the last meeting. Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, advised that all conditions and informatives had been noted by officers and would be included in the decision notice.

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 9 September 2019 be approved.**

### **366. HGY/2019/1775 - LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS**

The Committee considered an application for approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, access, pertaining to Buildings D3 and D4, forming Phase 2 of the Eastern Quarter, including the construction of 101 residential

units and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning permission HGY/2017/3117 dated 19th April 2018.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers and the applicant responded to questions from the Committee:

The applicant team had worked with the Council's Carbon Management Team, ventilation experts and noise consultants to assess the impact of the energy centre on residents and the public. All emissions would exit the building via a flue at the roof level, and not out of the ground floor. There was a condition which required that the noise level would not exceed 10dB of the background noise, and this would be monitored by a noise kit. There would be some heat from the ground level – 40 degrees, at 4mph – but this would be in areas with planting so that people could not walk closely to the vents, and would not be underneath any balconies. Around a third of the vents would emit warm air, a third would take in cold air, and a third would be doors – therefore it could be controlled where the warm air vents would be situated.

- The plan was for the Council to take on the lease for the energy centre, and to deliver affordable energy to homes in the borough. It was expected that 5000 new homes would be coming forward in future years, and the energy centre would be able to supply the energy for all of these. It was envisaged that the energy centre would be supplying energy within the next 15 years.
- There were a number of safeguards on the roof space – a 1.2m brick parapet at the edge of the roof top, with a 20cm metal balustrade. There was also a further 1m high fence around the inner communal area.
- There was no difference in design for the energy centre block and other blocks in the development.
- All units were wheelchair accessible, but there were no wheelchair adaptable homes for people to live in the D4 block. Blocks A, B, C were to be built over underground carparks and all had wheelchair adaptable homes.
- The Moselle walkway would be locked at night, and the development of Brook Road would encourage activity in the area. Officers were confident that the area would not become a quiet area to attract anti-social behaviour. There would be a onsite presence to manage the community spaces, the Moselle Walk and the courtyard.
- The ground floor of the block was subject to more detailed design, however due to the energy centre, majority of the frontage would be blank façade or vents.
- Members were reminded that the application was for reserved matters for blocks D3 and D4 and that planning permission had already been approved to include an energy centre in block D4.
- All units in block D4 would be dual aspect. Block D3 had 21 single aspect units. All 3 and 4 bedroom units would have a separate kitchen/diner and living room.
- The development would be car free, with no residents permits available.
- The comments of the QRP in relation to overlooking were made in regard to blocks D1-4, and the design had been revised between the QRP meeting and the reserved matters application for these blocks.

Members discussed the closure of the Moselle Walk during the hours of darkness and considered that this would have a negative impact on the use of the shared spaces / communal areas by cyclists. Officers advised that the Wood Green Area Action Plan would look at cycle connectivity, and that a walking / cycling action plan was being developed. Members also raised concerns that the communal spaces would not be user friendly to both cyclists and pedestrians. Councillor Cawley-Harrison proposed that a condition be added to specify that money should be spent on segregating cycle lanes, and any analysis which did not support the segregation should be considered by Full Council, rather than under officer delegated powers. Robert Walker, the Council's Lawyer, advised that this could not be a condition placed on the developer as it would be for the Council to implement. He advised that an informative could be included for the Planning department to investigate how money could be spent on segregated cycle lanes.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison indicated that he would not be happy with an informative and not a condition. Mr Walker suggested that the Planning Sub-Committee could, separate from determination of the reserved matters application, resolve that:

*“The Planning Department investigates and explores how segregated cycle lanes can be provided within and around the Development using funds from the Walking and Cycling Contribution (to be paid to the Council pursuant to the section 106 agreement dated 19 April 2018) and that a report be brought back to the Sub-Committee on this matter.”*

Councillor Bevan moved that a condition be added that segregated cycle lanes be provided on this development. Councillor Williams seconded the motion. Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, advised that as the application was for reserved matters, then the condition would only apply to blocks D3 and D4, and not the whole development.

The Chair moved that the application be granted, with the additional conditions and resolution as discussed, and following a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that:

- i) reserved matters be approved, and the Head of Development Management, or the Assistant Director of Planning be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report, subject to the following addition:

*Condition: That separate cycle lanes be provided on the development.*

*[Clerks note: the wording for any additional conditions and informatives approved by the Committee will be formulated by the Planning Service and included on the decision notice.]*

- ii) The Planning Department is requested to investigate and explore how segregated cycle lanes can be provided within and around the Development using funds from the Walking and Cycling Contribution (to be paid to the Council

pursuant to the section 106 agreement dated 19 April 2018) and that a report be brought back to the Sub-Committee on this matter.

**367. HGY/2019/0938 - 38 CRAWLEY ROAD, N22 6AG**

The Committee considered an application for approval of the demolition of existing buildings and erection of two part-three part-four storey residential blocks and a row of three-storey terraced houses (total of 29 units) and provision of a pedestrian/cycle link connecting Crawley Road to Downhills Way, plus landscaping, cycle and car parking, and other associated works.

The Planning Officer gave a presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

Officers and the applicant responded to questions from the Committee:

- The brick colour was likely to be buff, rather than yellow, which was sympathetic to the local area.
- The intention was to create some form of traffic calming at either end of the development. The space would be narrowed by landscaping and a footpath, and Downhills Way would likely be calmed through public realm work. Landscaping would also be used in front of properties to discourage parking against properties.
- A number of environmental conditions were included on the addendum.
- There would be 67 cycle spaces provided.
- A contribution of £35k would be provided towards landscaping to the east of the site.

The Chair moved that the application be approved, and following a vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED that:

- i) reserved matters be approved, and the Head of Development Management, or the Assistant Director of Planning be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms as set out in the Committee report.
- ii) That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (i) above is to be completed no later than 4<sup>th</sup> November 2019 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- (iii) That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (i) within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) above, planning permission shall be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions; and

- (iv) That delegated authority be granted to the Assistant Director of Planning/Head of Development Management 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 Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-Committee.
- (v) That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (i) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) 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 on-site affordable housing, would fail to provide much needed affordable housing stock within the Borough and would set an undesirable precedent for future similar planning applications. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP2 of the Council's Local Plan 2017 and Policy 3.12 of the London Plan 2016.
  2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team 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 Local Plan 2017 Policies SP8 and SP9.
  3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations for mitigation measures to promote sustainable transport, by reason of its lack of car parking provision would significantly exacerbate pressure for on-street parking spaces in surrounding streets, prejudicing the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2016, SP7 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM32 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
  4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 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 Policies 5.2, 5.3 and 5.7 of the London Plan 2016, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
  5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure works to the public highway and other public realm improvements including the connection through the application site to Downhills Way, would have an unacceptable negative impact the visual amenity of the area and the operation of the public highway, and would fail to meet the requirements of Site Allocation SA60. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM1 and DM33 of the Development Management DPD 2017, Policy 7.5 of the London Plan 2016, and the aims and objectives of SA60 of the Site Allocations DPD.

(vi) In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (v) 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 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 (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

**368. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**369. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**370. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**371. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

11 November 2019

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....