

MINUTES OF MEETING REGULATORY COMMITTEE HELD ON Monday, 5th October, 2020, 7.00 – 8.50PM

PRESENT:

Councillors: Sarah Williams (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Reg Rice, Viv Ross and Yvonne Say

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair informed the Committee that the meeting would be live streamed on the Council's website.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Basu, Hinchcliffe and Peacock

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillors Bevan and Stone.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings held on 6, 14 and 31 July 2020 be approved as a correct record.

6. PLANNING SERVICES 2020/21 QUARTER 2 UPDATE

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda. Each service head would introduce their section of the report.

Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management, Enforcement and Planning, introduced the section of the report entitled Development Management, as set out in the agenda. Mr Hermitage amended the figure for the number of cases on-hand at the end of August 2020, which should have been 447 and not 513. He explained that there had been a peak in the number of enforcement complaints received during the lockdown period, as well as a backlog of sites.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a question regarding the threshold for the overturns for refusals, it was explained that the threshold should remain at 10% or below. It was noted that it would currently take two or more losses to take the figure above the threshold.
- The planning statistics for major applications were reported every quarter to MHCLG (The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) and every Council was also required to publish these on their website.
- In response to a question regarding enforcement figures, it was explained that the service currently served on average around 90-110 notices per year. This meant that the Council had the 10th highest number of notices served of any other local authority last year, and the 5th highest the year before that.
- It was confirmed that member training on conservation areas would be added to the list of future training topics.
- Mr Hermitage would speak to the enforcement team to ensure that members were being sent out the results of enforcement cases, where requested, and would also follow up any of those requested personally by Councillor Bevan. It was confirmed that the two appeal sites pending related to the hardware store application on West Green Road and the demolition of a large 1920s house in Highgate.
- With regard to the correct site address being given for the Bridge Castle Museum site, it was stated that some sites were subject to registered addresses, however Mr Hermitage agreed to take this away and look into the matter.
- It was confirmed that the timescale for the determination of planning applications was dependent on the type of planning application. Minor and other applications was 8 weeks, Majors were 12 weeks and those with an environmental impact assessment took 16 weeks. The majority of applications were determined within the target of 56 days. It was noted that major applications that took a long time to determine, such as the new Tottenham Hotspur Football Ground, would have an impact on these figures. It was also confirmed that there had been no leeway given for any delays caused by Covid-19.
- Reference was made to paragraph 5.12 of the report and it was confirmed that 10 council homes out of the 111 homes in total related to applications where the Council was the applicant.

Brice Tudball, Planning Policy Manager, introduced the section of the report entitled Planning Policy & Infrastructure plan policy update – pages 9-11 in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a concern raised that there was no recognition of industrial space in the borough and the provision of land for employment, it was explained that key issues of the supply and demand for employment land in the borough would be addressed in the Local Plan.
- In response to a question regarding the sewage works at Pinkham Way, it was stated that there had been a lack of detail in the sub version of the NLWP (North

London Waste Plan) regarding the list of appropriate uses for the site, potential flood risks across the site and suitable future development for the site.

- Reference was made to CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) and whether the level could be increased again post Covid. In response, it was stated that an increase in CIL had been proposed for residential uses and some developments in the East of the borough, accompanied by a robust viability assessment. It was noted that Covid would be taken into consideration by the Inspector, however they would not be able to recommend that the Council reduce their rates post Covid.
- In response to a question regarding the cycling and walking action plan and the school streets action plan, it was stated that they had not been referenced in the report as they were not within the pure planning remit. The cycling and walking action plan was due to go to Cabinet before the consultation took place and was expected to be adopted in 2021. The cycling and walking plan had actually been sped up as a result of Covid, due to the provision of temporary cycle routes. The school streets action plan had also been delayed and was expected to be published in Spring/Summer 2021. This was as a result of urgent interventions surrounding social distancing requirements outside schools. It was noted that there was capital in the capital programme, so the project was not reliant on TfL funding.
- It was explained that Highgate school had SPD (Supplementary Planning Documents), as there was a clear commitment in the local plan and imminent planning applications for the school. It was important to ensure that residents could engage in the SPD, following the initial approval by Cabinet in March 2020. The team were looking to restart the process soon.

Bob McIver, Head of Building Control, introduced the section of the report entitled Building – pages 11-13 in the agenda. Mr Iver stated that the income and applications received by the building control service had reduced as a result of Covid. However, they had started to see a rise in the number of applications received over the past 4 weeks. The service had also made an application to the Government's compensation scheme due to the loss of income.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- It was recognised that some developers had chosen not to use the Council's building control service and had decided to go to a private company. In response, Mr McIver was unsure of the reason for this but stated that there was around a 50/50 split of people using the Council and going to a private company, of which there were quite a few. It was believed that there was a number of reasons for this, with costs being a big consideration. The Council also carried out a number of inspections and some developers may choose to go elsewhere where there were not so many checks. He was currently working with colleagues in Development Management to try to resolve this problem.
- In response to a question regarding the Grenfell inspection and the service's expertise, Mr McIver confirmed that all of the surveyors within the service had undertaken their level 6 fire safety qualification. The Government had asked for a review, which had issued 53 recommendations, with one of the issues being the choice of provider. A Building Safety Bill was coming in for in-scope buildings,

with a building safety review, to be undertaken by the Health & Safety Executive. Concern was raised regarding in-scope buildings and those without residential accommodation which were over 18m, which were not covered by the Local Authority building control team.

- In response to a question regarding the workforce and the possibility of offering apprenticeships, it was stated that this had been discussed with HR. The suggestion had been to downgrade vacant building surveyor posts to allow an apprentice to come in. The issue being raised was that once the apprentice was trained and fully qualified, there was currently no post for them to go into and they often then left the Council to take up another opportunity elsewhere. This was an ongoing issue which the Chair also agreed to look into, in liaison with officers.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

7. NEW HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN - FIRST STEPS ENGAGEMENT

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda.

Bryce Tudball, Planning Policy Team Manager, outlined the report and the appendices, as set out in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- It was felt that the images used on pages 58 and 128 of the gun shop were inappropriate.
- A number of minor mistakes in the word processing of the document were identified, which needed to be amended.
- Pages 69 – the opportunity for new leisure and cultural provision listed on page 70 should also be listed on page 69.
- It was believed that the green space referred to on the map on page 117 was Muswell Hill golf course.
- The number of wards identified on page 203 should be 9 and not 8 as listed.
- It was important to be consistent with the use of either old or new Wards.
- It was felt that the image used for the cycle superhighway should be more inclusive.
- Could an update be given on Cross Rail 2 as it was felt that a lot of the information was based on this.
- Pages 49 and 55 – it was felt that the colours used made it difficult to read the information in the various panels.
- Page 97 – the use of the image used on this page could be contentious.
- Some of the language used was not accessible for every reader. It was felt that the document was too large and should be structured in a way on the website that it could be split up into sections, to be make it more accessible.
- Members questioned who would carry out the consultation work.
- Page 50 – did all of the borough's parks have a green flag now?

- Page 51 – it was suggested that the jobs statistics from June 20 are dated and may not reflect the latest position. It was requested that the document provide more up to date information if available.
- Page 86 – The map only identified one tube station but did not reflect the nearby tube stations in neighbouring boroughs.
- Page 87 – The Odeon cinema had changed to an Everyman cinema around 3 years ago.
- Page 100 – it was unclear how the Council's proposal to secure affordable housing from developments of all size fits with the Government's consultation proposal to increase the affordable housing threshold.
- Page 101 – it was important that developers build affordable housing rather than accept payments in lieu; this also applies to securing carbon neutral developments rather than accepting offsets.
- Page 203 – it was questioned where the information was sources regarding the level of deprivation in the borough.
- It suggested that the RNLB could be used to ensure that the document was accessible.
- Page 301 – was the BMG survey up to date?
- Look at the issue of car free developments and workmen and women not being able to park their vans.
- Page 42 – the Air Quality Action Plan was not listed as part of the strategies.
- Like to see some engagement with some of the new community groups that had started in the area linked to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- The use of social media and digital advertising was questioned.
- It was questioned whether there was the opportunity to engage with schools directly, rather than purely through a bulletin.
- The opportunity of using any vacant premises within high streets for pop up engagement and consultation units was raised.
- Page 301 – It was suggested that Gender Identity should be considered within the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) as well as socio-economic equalities
- Page 209 – It was suggested that the average life expectancy was decreasing in Haringey and that the IIA may be incorrect
- Page 210 – was there any information on the new health care provision in Muswell Hill being referred to.
- Page 248 – it was questioned whether the street names review was still taking place.

The following was provided in response to the questions and observations from the Committee:

- In response to the issue raised regarding Cross Rail 2, Mr Kyzyszowski explained that Local Plan right to have some mention of CR2 but should not be dependent on CR2 as happening slowly/significantly delayed from original timetable.
- Mr Tudball acknowledged the typing errors and requests for image changes and confirmed that they would be amended.
- In response to concerns raised regarding the size of the document, it was confirmed that a summary document of around 20-30 pages would be produced,

as well as a dedicated web page with the First Steps document being split into different sections.

- Mr Tudball confirmed that the planning policy team would carry out the consultation and that they had been engaging with the council's corporate communications team in relation to the consultation strategy and implementation.
- Clarification would be sought if all of the borough's parks were green flag parks.
- The economy sections of the document would be updated to reflect latest furlough data and number of people receiving universal credit, if available.
- In response to a question regarding affordable housing, it was explained that the Council had set out strong opposition to the Government's proposal to increase the affordable housing threshold. If policy and evidence was supportive the New Local Plan would seek to secure affordable housing contributions from schemes of all sizes.
- In response to a question regarding sites being carbon neutral, Mr Krzyszowski advised that the proposed approach was for this to be done on site as a default, and the evidence base in support of this was currently being strengthened.
- In response to a question regarding the level of deprivation within the borough, it was explained that this had been derived from the index of multiple deprivation. However, this information would be double checked.
- It was explained that a 2018 survey had been listed as background to the Communications and Engagement Plan, as officers were keen to understand consultation data we already hold and not to ask for duplicate surveys to be carried out.
- The transport section of the First Steps document included consideration of car free development and circumstances where this may not always be an appropriate option.
- It was confirmed that the Lead Cabinet Member had been updated in the Foreword of the documents published for Cabinet.
- The Air Quality Action Plan would be added to the list of strategies referenced in the First Steps Engagement document.
- The Planning Policy Team was working up a detailed implementation plan in relation to the upcoming consultation, detailing digital advertising, pop ups etc.
- The team were keen to engage with younger people and were looking at the best ways to do this.
- Further clarification would be provided in relation to the Muswell Hill new health care facility.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) The New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document (Appendix A) be commented on and noted;
- 2) Cabinet be recommended to approve for public consultation, in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document (Appendix A);

- 3) Cabinet be recommended to delegate authority to the Interim Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to agree the final version of the New Haringey Local Plan: First Steps Engagement consultation document, and other supporting material to be produced for consultation purposes including the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Scoping Report, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Climate Change and Sustainability to the extent that any changes to the versions approved by Cabinet are non-material (examples of changes permitted shall include minor text, layout and design changes as well as changes needed for clarification and for consultation purposes).

8. RECENT GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS ON PLANNING

Rob Krzyszowski, Interim Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, introduced the report, as set out in the agenda.

Members of the Committee raised the following questions and observations on the report and appendices:-

- In response to a question regarding the proposed changes to the current planning system and whether the Government had given a timescale for this, it was explained that the proposal was to bring some secondary legislation later this year. It was however felt that this was optimistic and that full implementation could not be achieved by the end of this year.
- Reference was made to some information in appendix A also being included in appendix B, especially around the determination of affordable housing. In response it was confirmed that this would be made clear in both appendices in the final version.
- Concern was raised regarding the levy and whether it would disadvantage Haringey. In response, it was explained that further detail was required from the Government to understand the impact of the proposals. Mr Tudball added that the service would not agree with a standardised national levy, which would disadvantage Haringey due to the differing values across the country and London. This point had been made clear in their response.

RESOLVED that:

- A) The response to the changes to the current planning system consultation, which was submitted on 1 October 2020, be noted.
- B) The Regulatory Committee provide comments on the draft response to the Planning for the Future White Paper ahead of its submission by 29 October 2020.

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

14 January 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date