

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 4TH OCTOBER, 2021, 7.00 - 7.40 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim (from item 7), Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Liz Morris, and Councillor Reg Rice.

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. PLANNING PROTOCOL

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Councillor Gina Adamou, Councillor Yvonne Say, and Councillor Viv Ross. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Emine Ibrahim.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 14 September 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

Councillor Rice noted that he had not received a paper copy of the agenda. The Principal Committee Co-ordinator confirmed that a copy had been dispatched in the post and apologised that it had not arrived.

7. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The Chair referred to the note on pre-application briefings and this information was noted.

8. PPA/2021/0011 - BRUNEL WALK, TURNER AVENUE ESTATE, N15 5HQ

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of the existing 36 temporary accommodation homes on site and redevelopment of Brunel Walk and some of the space between the Council buildings of Turner Avenue to create 44 additional new homes for Council rent.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Committee welcomed the mix of unit sizes that were proposed.
- In relation to parking, it was clarified that no parking spaces would be lost in the estate and that there would be two additional spaces in the Turner Avenue Estate area. Some members noted that the proposals included a number of family sized units and that this was likely to result in additional cars and stress on parking.
- It was noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) and the application report discussed the permeability of the site. Some members enquired whether the permeability of the site would be increased and cautioned that increasing the permeability of the site for vehicles could create some safety issues. The applicant team noted that the site was an alleyway at present with a number of avenues that were used as cut through routes. It was explained that the proposals would aim to reduce permeability of the site by defining public and private space more clearly with landscaping and boundary treatments.
- The Committee enquired about outlook and the proximity of balconies in Blocks B and C to the existing blocks, about the outlook from the mews houses, and about overlooking into the gable ends of existing blocks. The applicant team explained that the existing Turner Avenue Estate wings had outlook from the southern end and would look directly onto the new courtyards. It was noted that it had recently been confirmed that the units in the existing blocks were two bed units and that the applicant team would need to consider the position and treatment of the balconies in reference to the windows; it was added that consultation responses were also being considered.
- The Chair commented that there was a sketch which showed projecting balconies and that she would be opposed to having those, especially at the lower levels. She explained that these would not be very private and that people would likely cover up the transparent elements. It was explained that the application sought to optimise the number and types of accommodation on site and that recessed balconies used potential accommodation area and had a significant impact on the thermal performance of the building. The applicant team believed that the projecting balconies worked as part of the design. It was noted that they were considering the treatment of the balustrade and that some screening or alternative positioning of balconies might be possible but this would need to be weighed against the need to deliver as much high quality accommodation as possible.
- In response to a question from the Committee, the applicant team stated that some of the key challenges would be to integrate the development with the wider estate,

to deliver the significant enhancements to the existing public realm and open spaces, and to ensure that the buildings also respected the wider context and the properties on Seaford and Kirkton Roads. It was noted that there was the possibility of remodelling, potentially with reduced units or setting back, and that the balance of delivering affordable accommodation and safeguarding residential amenity would need to be carefully considered.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

9. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

10. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 1 November 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date