

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Monday, 11th January, 2021, 7.00 - 10.00 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sarah Williams (Chair), John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say, Liz Morris and Sheila Peacock**

### **485. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

### **486. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adamou, Basu, Hinchcliffe and Stone.

Councillor Morris was in attendance for Councillor Hinchcliffe.

Councillor Peacock was in attendance for Councillor Stone.

### **487. URGENT BUSINESS**

There was no such business.

### **488. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

Councillor Bevan advised that he was a member of the Homes for Haringey Board, but that this would not affect his consideration of the application (Ermine Road).

### **489. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2020 be approved as a correct record.**

### **490. HGY/2020/2794 - LAND TO THE NORTH OF ERMINE ROAD N15**

The Committee considered an application for the temporary planning permission for a period of 7 years to provide 38 modular residential homes for use as accommodation for people who have been street homeless, with associated cycle and refuse storage.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The units were 24m<sup>2</sup> which was below the minimum threshold for a one bedroom flat. This however was a specific proposal and was not designed to be the same

size as a standard one bedroom flat. It was designed to house a single person and to help people move on with their lives after a period of homelessness.

- The stairwells were to provide access to the units and not for occupants to gather as seating areas.
- The build time of the units was around one week, however the landscaping would take longer.
- Condition 18 required further surveys to be carried out to ensure that if a culverted main river was found to be present under or within 4m of the site, then a condition survey and strategy was required to protect the culvert before any further development can be carried out.
- The site would be managed by on-site staff, who could deal with any issues which may arise.
- A condition had been added to recommend a carbon offsetting payment.
- There had been no objections made by carbon management in relation to the installation of the air source heat pumps.
- There was private amenity space around the blocks on the grassed areas, but no communal spaces within the units.
- If the Committee felt that there was a specific issue with air source heat pumps and noise, then a condition could be added to ensure that the noise was at an acceptable domestic level.
- There was a 1.8m fence at the back of the site, and a 1.5m railing at the front.

Laura Budka spoke in objection to the application. There were concerns around the loss of privacy for neighbouring properties. The units would be two storeys high which would mean that neighbouring houses and gardens would be overlooked. Although the units did not have balconies, the access platforms were in direct eyelines of bedrooms. Ms Budka felt that local children would be discouraged from playing outside. No information had been provided on the residents who would be living in the units, and it was concerning to think that people with drug and alcohol issues would be housed closely to young families. The application stated that extra CCTV would be installed to mitigate the impact of the unit, but it was unacceptable that residents would experience any negative impacts due to the development. It was unclear how the development would make any positive impact on the area.

Maria Lincoln spoke in objection to the application. The units were 35% smaller than the national space standards, with exposed stairwells and frontages, causing a detrimental effect to the visual amenity on Ermine Road. There seemed to be no evidence of a noise impact study or the likely increase of anti-social behaviour. Residents of Ermine Road already experienced issues with littering, loitering and other anti-social behaviours, and Ms Lincoln stated that this was not the right area to build a development for vulnerable people to help them integrate back into a community.

Simche Steinberger, Hackney Council Ward Councillor, spoke in objection to the application. He was concerned that he had not been consulted on the application, given that he was a Councillor in a neighbouring ward. Mr Steinberger felt that the units were too small to be considered suitable. He felt that it would be unfair to local residents to have such a development on their road. He reiterated his worry that there

had been no consultation with Hackney Council and requested that the application be refused.

Councillor Barbara Blake spoke in objection to the application. She advised that majority of the residents in Ermine Road were opposed to the development. Haringey Council had not provided a strong management plan for the development, and there were concerns that the development would not be managed 24/7 and that the evenings would have a concierge on-site rather than site management. The development would have a detrimental impact on neighbours, with overlooking, increasing anti-social behaviour and noise levels. There was no plan to deal with residents of the development congregating outside of the units. The colour of the units was also considered to be an eyesore. Councillor Blake requested that the Committee take the views of residents into consideration and refuse the application.

Councillor Erdal Dogan spoke in objection to the application. Ermine Road and Seven Sisters Road were hotspots for crime and anti-social behaviour, with cheap alcohol sold everywhere. This did not make the area suitable for the type of residents in the development. If the applicant was granted, anti-social behaviour would become more acute in the area. Councillor Dogan added that residents should not have to suffer from disturbed sleep, anxiety and feeling unsafe in their own homes.

Objectors responded to questions from the Committee:

- Letters from the Council had been sent to residents in October. Consultation meetings had been cancelled and rescheduled to take place 2 days before the end of the statutory consultation period. It was felt that the person chairing the consultation meeting was in support of the application so residents had not felt comfortable putting their objections forward.
- Residents had not been informed of the type of support residents of the development would require. It was only when the job adverts for the units had been advertised that residents were aware that the job role required people who had experience dealing with alcohol and drug issues, and the criminal justice system. It was felt that there was a lack of transparency by the Council.

The Applicant Party - Mark Sleigh (Planning Agent), Emma Fletcher (Applicant – Hill), Gill Taylor (LBH), Robbie Erbmann (LBH) and Jon Glackin (Streetskitchen) - addressed the Committee.

The Covid-19 pandemic had resulted in unprecedented pressures on homelessness. The development would provide 37 essential homes for homeless people in the borough. Each unit would be provided with everything required for a home, and each unit met secure by design principles. The corporate colours for Hill were orange and grey and the modular units were manufactured in these colours.

The Council had housed over 850 homeless people during the pandemic, with people still living in hotels while waiting for longer term options. The units would provide support to people to move forward with their lives following a period of homelessness. The development would be funded through the rough sleepers accommodation programme, a scheme which was recognised by the MHCLG, who were looking to develop housing quickly for people in need. The borough currently provided more than 500 supported housing units in the borough and had experience in delivering

support housing services. Service users were usually more likely to be victims of crime rather than perpetrators, however the service worked closely with local Safer Neighbourhood Teams and had robust anti-social behaviour plans.

Each unit would house one person, over the age of 18. The tenancies would be short-term, for up to two years. There would be a referrals process before any tenants were accepted. There would be a minimum of two staff on site at all times, and each resident will have their own key worker.

The units were a high quality design and the application was a product of extensive collaboration with Haringey Council officers.

The applicant team responded along with officers to questions from the Committee:

- There would be a member of staff in the office at all times, other staff would be encouraged to be working with residents within the units.
- The units were not designed to be hostels, they were designed to be independent tenancies so no communal areas would be provided. Each resident would be encouraged to gain their independence and have their own front doors. Although only one person would be allowed to live in the unit, there was space for visitors.
- The air source heat pumps were not located within the units, but within onsite plant rooms – one pump could provide heat to six units.
- It was appreciated that the colour of the units was not to everybody's tastes, however these were the colours that the units were manufactured in. 16 of the units would be gifted by Hill. Any changes to the colour would result in a delay in delivering the units to the site as this would have a significant impact on the building process.
- Hackney Council had not been consulted with as the distance from the site was over 450m.

Councillor Peacock moved that the based on the concerns of residents, Councillor Barbara Blake and Councillor Dogan, that block A be removed from the application and deferred to a future meeting. Councillor Bevan seconded the motion and added the issues raised with the colour and design of the units in that they did not complement the adjacent estate.

Dean Hermitage advised that any application had to be deferred as a whole.

The Chair moved that the application be deferred pending the removal of block A and design improved, and following a vote with 5 in favour and 3 against it was

**RESOLVED that the application be deferred.**

**491. PPA/2020/0024 - WEST INDIAN CULTURAL CENTRE (TO NOW BE KNOWN AS AFRICAN CARIBBEAN CULTURAL CENTRE) SITE, CLARENDON ROAD OFF HORNSEY PARK ROAD, N8 0DD**

The Planning Officer and Applicant Team outlined the proposal for the demolition of the three existing buildings and construction of a part 12/14 and part 6/8/10 storey

building incorporating a two storey base to provide a new cultural centre, co-workspace, gym and cafe, 85 residential units and 140 co-living units, with access, public realm improvements and landscaping and car and cycle parking.

The Applicant Team responded to questions from the Committee:

- The internal amenity space per person was 6.4m<sup>2</sup>.
- The building would be set back to respect existing trees, and substantial section 278 improvements would be made.
- There would be two entrances for the buildings, which would access properties of all tenures.
- Units on the corners of the building would be dual aspect. Single aspect units were all East or West facing to ensure the best sunlight.
- The cultural centre was operated on land owned by the Council, and held a 95 year lease. Ownership was irrelevant when considering planning permission.

**492. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

The Chair asked Members to send any queries by email to Dean Hermitage.

**493. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

The Chair asked Members to send any queries by email to Dean Hermitage.

**494. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**495. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

8 February 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....