

# **MINUTES OF MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Monday, 8th February, 2021, 7.00 - 10.00 pm**

## **PRESENT:**

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

### **496. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

### **497. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hinchcliffe. Councillor Morris was present as a substitute.

### **498. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **499. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bevan advised that he was a member of the Homes for Haringey Board but that this would not prejudice his decision-making.

Councillor Mitchell advised that he would speak in objection in relation to application HGY/2020/3036 and would be leaving the meeting after making his objection and therefore would not take part in the discussion or decision of the application.

### **500. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11 January 2021 be approved.**

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

*Clerks note: The Chair advised that she had received a number of emails lobbying on this application, and she had taken the decision to hand over the Chair for this item to the Vice-Chair and not take part in the discussion or decision of the application*

Councillor Gina Adamou in the Chair

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

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Paragraph 1.2 of the addendum clarified that the previous application had been deferred in response to concerns around the relationship of Block A with neighbouring properties and to explore whether Block A could be removed.
- A management plan was required under the conditions and would need to set out the how many staff would be on site and how the site would be managed.
- The addition of louvres to Block A would not have any effect on Secure By Design principles, and the applicant would be adjusting the position of CCTV cameras to take the additions into account.
- Officers had met with the applicants following the meeting to discuss the concerns raised by the Committee and whilst the applicant had decided not to remove Block A, they have amended the scheme to improve the relationship between Block A and the neighbouring properties. The Planning Service were not able to dictate amendments to applicants.

Laura Budka spoke in objection to the application. Principles of designing out crime advised against covering any balconies, and this had been added to the scheme. Block A still posed a problem with overlooking, and the additions to the scheme would create an echo in the corridors. It was also recommended to have three thresholds before a residential area, and the scheme only had one gate, which was open 24 hours a day. Unless there was a curfew for residents on the site, there would be movement through the scheme throughout the night. The orange doors were not in keeping with the existing pattern of build on neighbouring properties. There would be further parking issues than already experienced in the area. Ms Budka considered that this scheme was a social experiment at the expense of local residents.

Councillor Barbara Blake spoke in objection to the application. The new proposal did not address concerns raised by the Committee or local residents. The site was unsuitable for modular housing and the amendments made since the previous application would not mitigate any of the issues raised. Block A remaining in the design left a lack of open space in the site. Cllr Blake referred to the scheme adopted by Cambridge Council, which was a smaller scheme away from the town centre, which had helped residents to flourish away from negative influences. Cambridge Council had said that to achieve a successful outcome a supportive local network was crucial, which was not the case with this application. Cllr Blake urged the Committee to reject the application.

The Applicant Team – Mark Sleight (Planning Agent), Emma Fletcher (Applicant – Hill), Adi Cooper (Chair of Safeguarding Board for Haringey), Gill Taylor (LBH) and Robbie Erbmann (LBH) – addressed the Committee.

There was no overlooking from Block A, and the stairwell was invisible to homes South of the scheme. The presence of staff onsite 24 hours would reduce Anti-Social Behaviour – there would be CCTV onsite and staff would patrol the site on an hourly rotation.

To not maximise the life changing opportunity for homeless people would do a disservice to people in the Borough. The Safeguarding Board had made

homelessness a priority in 2019 following a spike in deaths. Secure accommodation with support helps people to recover and manage their lives in a way that hotels and hostels did not.

The Applicant Team and Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The homes had been designed with homeless charities and were designed in the best way for a single occupancy unit. Careful consideration had also been given to the design of the site as a whole and the relationship between the blocks.
- The decision by the applicants not to remove Block A was based on the design of the whole scheme and the orientation of the site did not encourage overlooking. There was also a road in between the site and neighbouring properties.
- There would be a 24 hour staff presence on site. A local management plan would be in place, which was usual in Supported Housing Services. Each member of staff would have a caseload of 3-7 people, which would give time to support people's needs. This was not a service for residential care or support, but to encourage independent living.
- It was anticipated that tenancies would last 12-18 months before residents were ready to move to other accommodation.
- The project in Cambridge referred to by Cllr Blake was the first project taken on by the Council and they were now looking at a new scheme with a further 40-50 units.

Some of the Members expressed their disappointment at the emotive language used by the Applicant Team and stated that they would only make a decision on the application based on material planning considerations.

Dean Hermitage advised that the Committee needed to make a decision on the application before them. There was the option to defer the decision if there were specific amendments that the Committee would wish to see. The Planning Authority could not dictate to the applicant to make any amendments. The options for the Committee were to vote on the officer's recommendations in the report or make an alternative resolution.

Councillor Say proposed that the applicant be deferred for the applicant to consider Block A and either substantially reduce or remove in order to reduce the number of homes on the site. Councillor Mitchell seconded the proposal.

The Chair moved to the vote, and with five in favour, four against and one abstention it was resolved that the application be deferred in order for the applicant to consider Block A and either substantially reduce or remove in order to reduce the number of homes on the site.

## **502. HGY/2020/3036 - REAR OF 132 STATION ROAD, N22 7SX**

Councillor Sarah Williams in the Chair

The Committee considered an application for the construction of 6 dwellings set in landscaped area and creation of 'community wildlife garden', following the demolition of existing structures.

Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The garden extended to 122 Station Road and 11 Barratt Avenue.
- The units were south-facing so were generally considered acceptable in terms of daylight and sunlight.
- There was very little demolition proposed on site – one small building and other remnants of outbuildings.

Toby Castle spoke in objection to the application. The site was bordered by Barratt Avenue and Park Avenue, part of the Wood Green Conservation Area. The previous application in 2018 was refused, and this application was for double the amount of homes (six) and failed to address the objections and concerns outlined in the Planning Inspectors decision. The development would alter the character of the site and would harm the quality and character of the Conservation Area. Local residents would have overbearing visual intrusion from the properties. The concerns raised by residents had been ignored.

Simon Fedida spoke in objection to the application. Over 50 people had objected to the application. The current application was larger than the last proposed application, and did not deal with the reasoning for the last refusal or appeal. The Officer Report undervalued the site as part of a Conservation Area. The green character of the area would be destroyed and the adverse impact outweighed the benefits of the development.

Councillor Peter Mitchell spoke in objection to the application. He referred to the National Planning Policy Framework and the protection of Conservation Areas as a reason to refuse applications. The previous application was dismissed on appeal on the grounds that the character and appearance of the area would be unacceptably harmed. The design element of this application was overscaled, and there were serious issues with the living conditions. The new London Plan referred to level access to private amenity space – this application had private amenity space at basement level, accessible by bedrooms. All houses were single aspect with one window at ground floor level. He urged the Committee to reject the application.

*Clerks note: Cllr Mitchell left the meeting after his submission.*

Mark Pender (Planning Consultant) addressed the Committee. The new proposal for the site was covering an area twice the size of previous applications, which was a significant difference. All of the houses were set into the ground to create an 'upside down' house, and green roofing would help the scheme blend into the area. The scheme was led by the landscaping of the site.

The Applicant and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Applicant would be happy to include a condition to prevent the installation of satellite dishes.

- A full daylight assessment according to BRE calculations had been carried out, with the design amended as a result. All rooms now pass the daylight test.
- The benefits of the scheme were the quality elements, the properties were unique to the site. Despite being single aspect, none of the properties would provide substandard living accommodation.
- The Applicant had experience of installing green roofs for 14 years, so had an understanding of what was required to design, install and maintain to a high standard. There was a maintenance condition included in the permission, which would include the maintenance of the gardens. It was hoped that residents would also take control of day to day issues and report any maintenance issues to the management company.
- Neighbouring residents would be offered replacement fences – if the offer was not taken up then new fences would be built in front of the neighbours fences.

Dean Hermitage summed up the application and advised that the recommendation was to grant with the conditions as set out in the report, along with the additional condition to not allow the installation of satellite dishes.

The Chair moved that the application be approved and following a vote with 8 in favour and 2 against it was

#### RESOLVED

- i. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- ii. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Standards and Sustainability 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.
- iii. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 08/04/2021 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- iv. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (i) within the time period provided for in resolution (ii) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
- v. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The development, in the absence of a legal agreement does not include a formal undertaking to secure a contribution to allow the modification of the existing traffic order to exempt future occupants of the proposal from purchasing parking permits and alterations to the public highway, arising as a result of the development. 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.
  
- 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 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.

### **503. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

*Clerks note: Cllr Mitchell returned to the meeting for the consideration of the rest of the items on the agenda.*

Members noted the report and commented on the following:

- Page 209 referred to '311 Roundway' – the exact location was unless so would be useful to contain some extra information on where the development was located.
- Further information was requested on Cranwood House.
- Page 210, Partridge Way, referred to 17 units – clarification was sought as to whether this should be 27 units.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

### **504. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

### **505. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **506. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

8 March 2021

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank