

# **MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 12 OCTOBER 2020, 7.00 - 10.30 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

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

### **447. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

### **448. PLANNING PROTOCOL**

Members and speakers were requested to note the information as set out at item two of the agenda.

### **449. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hinchcliffe and Stone.

Councillor Peacock was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Stone.

### **450. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **451. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Bevan and Peacock declared an interest in respect of applications HGY/2020/1584 & 1586 and HGY/2020/1361 as they had been present at a meeting with Tottenham Hotspur where a presentation of the applications had been shown.

### **452. HGY/2020/1851 - LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS, BETWEEN HORNSEY PARK ROAD, MAYES ROAD, COBURG ROAD, WESTERN ROAD AND THE KINGS CROSS / EAST COAST MAINLINE, CLARENDON GAS WORKS, OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE, AND 57-89 WESTERN ROAD N8**

The Committee considered an application for the approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, access, pertaining to Buildings E1, E2 and E3, forming Phase 3 of the Eastern Quarter, including the construction of residential units (Use Class C3), commercial floorspace, basement, and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning permission HGY/2017/3117 dated 19th April 2018.

Officers and Matthew Rees (on behalf of the applicant) responded to questions from the Committee:

- The scheme was part of a very large hybrid permission granted in 2018. Affordable housing had been determined at the outline stage, and 32.5% affordable housing would be provided across the development. This would mean that some areas of the scheme would have more affordable housing than other areas.
- There were currently a number of temporary meanwhile uses on the site and these businesses were aware that the tenancies were temporary.
- The site would create 10,000sqm of employment space.
- 64% of the units were dual aspect, which was an improvement to the 45-55% agreed to in the outline consent. Any single aspect units would overlook a wide street with trees and planting and not look directly into another unit.
- The community area would be run as a not for profit space and would be managed by the Estate Management Team. Any surplus at the end of the year could be used to provide free hire to community groups. Under the s106, the applicant was required to submit a management plan for the community room and part of this plan could include a suggested list of residents groups and councillors to be consulted on the spending of any surplus funds.
- The daylight and sunlight levels were reasonable considering the development was in a dense location and the buildings were in the heart of the development.
- The development as a whole was required to provide 10% disabled car parking spaces. This element provided 6% but officers would ensure that 10% was achieved as each element of the outline permission came forward.
- £7.5m would be collected from the development in CIL payments.
- The applicant had engaged closely with the Council's Transport Team who along with TfL supported the road layout proposals. The pavement and the road would be segregated and any further segregation for cycles would reduce the pedestrian space. The road would be predominantly used by cyclists so would be cycle-friendly. Members commented that a separate cycle lane would be preferable.

Councillor Williams proposed that a condition be added to redesign the landscaping to include a segregated cycle lane in the existing road. Councillor Basu seconded the proposal.

Mr Hermitage summed up the report and advised that the recommendation was to grant the application subject to the s106 agreement, the conditions and informatives set out in the report and addendum, an amendment to the landscaping condition relating to the redesign to include a cycle lane, and an amendment to the community room condition to include an annual consultation with a list of local stakeholders (including local councillors and residents groups).

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

RESOLVED that the planning permission be granted and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives.

**453. HGY/2020/1584 & 1586 - 798-808 HIGH ROAD, N17 0DH**

The Committee considered an application for the approval of:

**Planning Permission:** Full planning application for the erection of a four storey building with flexible A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2 uses; external alterations to 798-808 High Road; change of use of 798-808 High Road to a flexible A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2 uses; demolition of rear extensions to Nos. 798, 800-802, 804-806, 808 and 814 High Road; erection of new rear extensions to Nos. 798, 800-802, 804-806 and 808 High Road; hard and soft landscaping works; and associated works.

**Listed Building Consent:** Listed building consent for internal and external alterations to 798-808 High Road, including the demolition of rear extensions Nos. 798, 800-802, 804-806 and 808 High Road; erection of new rear extensions to Nos. 798, 800-802, 804-806 and 808 High Road; and associated works.

Officers and the applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- The design for the extensions was deliberately different to the existing approved extension following discussion with the QRP.
- The applicant was happy for the lighting to be conditioned to allow further discussion with officers on the lighting design for the courtyard.
- Haringey Building Control would be used.
- An informative could be provided to request the applicant to explore additional community use activities.
- The design for the gates would be conditioned so that the applicant could discuss the detail with officers.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison proposed that condition one be amended to reduce the time limit from four to three years. Councillor Ross seconded the proposal and following a request from the Committee to vote on the proposal it was unanimously agreed that the condition be amended.

Mr Hermitage summed up the report and advised that the recommendation was to grant the application subject to the s106 agreement, the conditions and informatives set out in the report and addendum, the amendment to condition one and the addition of an informative in relation to community use activities.

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

RESOLVED

HGY/2020/1584

- i. That planning permission be granted and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability be authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informative and signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below and a section 278 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
  - ii. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (i) above is to be completed no later than **31 January 2021** or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow.
  - 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 is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
- HGY/2020/1586
- iv. That Listed Building Consent be granted and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning Building Standards and Sustainability be authorised to issue the Listed Building Consent and impose conditions and informatives.
  - v. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions (planning permission and/or Listed Building Consent) as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
  - vi. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (i. & iv.) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) above, the planning application and Listed Building Consent applications be refused for the following reasons:

#### **Planning Application**

- i. In the absence of an Employment and Skills Plan the proposals would fail to ensure that Haringey residents benefit from growth and regeneration. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy 4.12 and DM DPD Policy DM40.
- ii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of a further revised Energy Strategy, including connection to a DEN, and carbon offset payments the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2 and Strategic Policy SP4, and DM DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.

- iii. In the absence of legal agreement securing a Travel Plan, financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring and Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments to prevent future occupiers from obtaining Business permits the proposals would rely disproportionately on unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13. Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.
- iv. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme and the borough's Construction Partnership and monitoring of a Construction Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan, the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies 5.3, 7.15, Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

### **Listed Building Consent**

- i. In the absence of a planning permission for the proposed change of use and extension of the Listed Buildings, the proposed removal of historic fabric and internal and external alterations would be unnecessary and unacceptable. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies 7.8 and 7.9, Strategic Policy SP12 and DM DPD Policy DM9.
- vii. In the event that the Planning Application and/or Listed Building Consent Application are refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission and associated Listed Building Consent which duplicates the Planning Application and Listed Building Consent 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.

### **454. HGY/2020/1361 - NOS. 807 HIGH ROAD, N17 8ER**

*Clerks note – the Chair suspended Standing Orders at 21.50 to allow the meeting to continue past 22.00 for the consideration of this item.*

The Committee considered an application for the approval of the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a replacement building up to four storeys to include

residential (C3); retail (A1); and flexible D1/B1 uses; hard and soft landscaping works including a residential podium; and associated works.

Officers and the applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- Block b could be accessed via the High Road and by the alleyway. Officers had looked to ensure that the entrance was well lit and had a canopy to make the space more hospitable and welcoming.
- The dentist would be accessed from the High Road, via a lift.
- The cycle parking had been redesigned to be solely residential.
- A condition to develop a waste management plan had been included, and it was expected that it would be the responsibility of the management company or residents to take the bins to the front of the building for waste collection. Members commented that the current proposals were not suitable and that further options should be explored.
- The relocation of the Co-Op Funeral Directors had been signed off by the company's surveyors.
- Discussions were being held with Tottenham Hotspur to ensure that parking was managed better on match days and the use of Percival Court.
- The wheelchair accessible unit was contained in Block B which was accessible from the High Road.
- There was an additional legal obligation to ensure that future residents were aware of the adjoining pub garden prior to occupation.

Members commented that the playground area on a roof next to a loud pub did not make sense. The applicant advised that it was not a playground but a communal terrace space which could accommodate the small number of children that may live in the building.

The Committee requested that condition one be amended to reduce the time limit to three years.

Mr Hermitage summed up the report and advised that the recommendation was to grant the application subject to the s106 agreement, the conditions and informatives set out in the report and addendum, and the amendment to condition one to reduce the time limit to three years.

Councillor Cawley-Harrison moved that the application be refused on the grounds that Percival Court did not provide a safe passageway for access, including residents accessing cycle parking, commercial premises and access to the disabled parking bay. Councillor Bevan seconded the proposal and added the unsuitable waste management proposal to the reasons for rejection.

Following a vote with six in favour and four against, it was RESOLVED that the application be refused.

#### **455. HGY/2020/1841 - REAR OF 132 STATION ROAD N22 7SX**

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

**456. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

The Chair requested that any questions be sent directly to Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management.

**457. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

The Chair requested that any questions be sent directly to Dean Hermitage, Head of Development Management.

**458. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**459. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

9 November 2020

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank