

MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 5TH JULY, 2021, 7.13 - 10.05 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair) (from item 8), Councillor Gina Adamou, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim, Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Liz Morris, Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross, and Councillor Yvonne Say.

The meeting commenced at 7.13pm. The meeting was adjourned at 7.13pm in order to rectify some technical difficulties and recommenced at 7.20pm

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 Dhiren Basu. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Sheila Peacock.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. MINUTES

In relation to the Planning Sub-Committee on 8 June 2021, Councillor Emine Ibrahim noted that she had also declared that she was a member of AISA (Arsenal Independent Supporters' Association).

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 19 April 2021 and 24 May 2021, be confirmed and signed as a correct record and that, subject to the

amendment above, the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 8 June 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

8. PRE/2020/0213 - REYNARDSON COURT, HIGH ROAD, N17 9HX

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the development of the land to the rear of Reynardson Court, High Road, to provide 18 residential homes fronting Rycroft Way and associated landscaping (Reynardson Court to be refurbished).

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

- In terms of the mature trees and green space on the site, it was confirmed that Haringey had a policy to resist the loss of open space. It was highlighted that, in this case, the space was a non-designated open space so there would need to be an assessment of whether the proposal was offset by any benefits. It was added that there was a policy to protect spaces, including designated and non-designated spaces, and that the site allocation policy allowed for loss/ improvement of open space and trees.
- It was stated that the building would be four storeys tall, one storey taller than the adjacent building, and lower than two trees on the frontage. The applicant team commented that the proposal was not considered to be excessively tall.
- In terms of disabled access, it was clarified that a step free route would be maintained to the dwellings. The Committee suggested that disabled parking should be located near the associated dwellings. The applicant team noted that access was currently through the public realm but that this could be reviewed. It was added that the final details for the application were being finalised by the Transport Consultant.
- The Committee commented that the building design shown in the Computer Generated Imagery (CGI) was fairly stark and it was queried whether the 'green street' had sufficient planting. These points were noted by the applicant team. It was explained that the results of the below ground survey had been received and that, following discussions with the Tree Officer, it would be possible to include trees within the plans. It was added that there would be additional trees on Rycroft Way. It was explained that the footway would be subject to 'greening' but that there was little capacity on site to set back without reducing the number of units. It was noted that the available space would not allow trees to grow to maturity and that the green space shown in the images was within the demise of the buildings and would be maintained by Homes for Haringey.
- It was noted that the report suggested that the development would improve quality and safety and the Committee requested further detail. The applicant team explained that it was aimed to incorporate some security features within the landscaping and that Secured by Design had provided some input. It was also commented that previously raised scale and massing issues had been addressed in the current design and it was considered that this was a higher quality build.

- It was confirmed that the design aimed to minimise overlooking and that there would be approximately 15-16 metres separation from the rear of Reynardson Court. It was added that the rooms facing Reynardson Court would mainly be bathrooms and kitchens, with some bedrooms located on the corners of the building; it was noted that this information could be included in the plans.
- It was noted that the Quality Review Panel would be considering the proposal in July 2021.
- In relation to the area for doorstep play, it was clarified that there would be 130m² of play space on site, in accordance with the London Plan requirement, and that 69m² of this would be doorstep play. This was demonstrated on page 34 of the agenda pack.
- In relation to the refurbishment of Reynardson Court, it was confirmed that each flat would be surveyed and would be brought up to a decent standard. It was also noted that there would be a section 105 housing consultation and wider pre-application public engagement, as well as a formal public planning consultation once the planning application was received. It was added that communications with residents would include confirmation of necessary works to the flats, prospective timescales, and how to contact the engagement team.
- The Committee also requested that the design of the new build should complement Reynardson Court.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

9. PPA/2021/0016 - WOODRIDINGS COURT, CRESCENT ROAD N22 7RX

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the redevelopment of the disused parking court/ amenity deck to the rear of an existing 4 storey block of Council flats to create 29 additional new homes.

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

- It was enquired whether the proposal had sufficient three bed units and whether the balconies would be fully enclosed to protect from noise disturbance and to ensure appropriate temperature control. It was explained that, in balancing the units with the location, it was considered that the location may not be suitable for three bed units but that the mix of units could still be amended. In relation to the balconies, it was noted that these would be 6-7m² amenity spaces in the corners of the buildings. It was noted that these were not internalised and were winter gardens. It was explained that there were screens for acoustic privacy but it was accepted that, due to possible weather and noise, it may not be practical to use the balconies at all times.
- In relation to parking, it was confirmed that no parking would be provided by the proposal. It was explained that there was an intention to have an active car club and that the applicant team was in contact with two car club providers.
- It was clarified that the applicant proposed to remove the ramp on the site and that the road would connect to a new, wider lobby which would result in improved access within the building so that there would be a single entry point and so that all residents could access their apartments from the lift or the stairs.
- The Committee expressed some concerns that the development would be car free but that the surrounding area did not have Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). The

applicant team commented that the scheme was not able to provide parking; they asked whether the Council might be able to assist with this and suggested that it might be useful to consider this at the consultation stage.

- It was noted that there were some concerns about having a single point of entry due to some previous anti-social behaviour issues and it was enquired which areas would be public and which would be residential. The applicant team explained that the spaces at the front and side of the building were intended to be private spaces for residents and would not be open to the public. It was added that the applicant team was looking forward to engaging with residents to determine how to make the spaces as practical as possible. It was also noted that the block had undergone decent homes improvements approximately five years' ago but that some further, although less intrusive, improvement works were planned in 2022-23.
- It was commented that the applicant was proposing to remove the concrete structure on the site to open up the building to additional natural light. It was noted that new glazing would be set slightly away to provide some three dimensional space, with a view of the courtyard and some visual points of interest. It was also confirmed that all apartments would have 6m² of space in the form of a winter garden.
- Some members noted that there were a number of maisonettes in the surrounding area and that it would be beneficial to provide more family homes if possible.

The Chair acknowledged that this was a challenging site and thanked the applicant team for attending.

At 8.50pm, the Committee agreed a short adjournment; the meeting resumed at 8.55pm.

10. PRE/2020/0004 - OMEGA WORKS, 167 HERMITAGE ROAD, N4 1LZ

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition with façade retention and erection of buildings of 4 to 9 storeys with part basement to provide a mix of commercial spaces, warehouse living and C3 residential.

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

- It was noted that the site was privately owned and that the proposals involved neighbouring land owners. It was explained that the site was within site allocation number 32 (Omega Works) of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) 2017 and it was expected that there would be an increase in mixed-use development, including warehouse accommodation, and improved accessibility. It was noted that the proposed site allocations spoke to each other and that the site to the north was part of a different site allocation.
- It was noted that the proposals would provide 76 residential units and 67 bedspaces within two types of warehouse living, including single level and split level. It was explained that the warehouse living component would comprise eight units, with between two and 15 bedrooms per unit. It was added that the minimum bedroom area would be 12m², which was above London standards, and that the ratio of space per person 42-45m², which was above the standard for a studio unit. It was also noted that there would be communal cycle parking, storage, workspaces, laundry rooms, and bathrooms.

- In relation to affordable housing, it was noted that the site allocation did not give a position on this concept and so this was open for consideration. It was noted that, based on the initial scoping, the scheme was just considered to be viable but that, if there was any value left in the scheme, some affordable housing might be provided. It was explained that warehouse living was smaller than conventional housing but did meet a housing need and so the proposal would require appropriate consideration.
- It was commented that there was existing employment use on the site and that existing uses were an important consideration. It was noted that the site allocation discussed affordable workspaces and employment uses and it was important to factor this into the consideration of the scheme. It was explained that a robust viability assessment would be undertaken and that affordable housing would be provided if possible but it was highlighted that there was a requirement for affordable workspaces which would have to be factored into the viability.
- Some concerns were noted about the height of the blocks at the rear of the Omega A proposals. It was clarified that a sunlight and daylight assessment would be undertaken under the next stage of the process and would involve a more detailed analysis. It was explained that this issue was being considered and that there would be a buffer zone between the site and the Crusader Estate. It was noted that there would be approximately 8 metres between the proposed buildings on the eastern side of the site and that there would be a combination of lightweight, transparent, and frosted glazing and metal panels to allow light and minimise overlooking.
- The applicant team clarified that, although they would need to temporarily relocate whilst works were undertaken, it was aimed to retain the existing tenants on the site. It was noted that there would be similar levels of rents and that the spaces would be better utilised.
- It was confirmed that there would be one sustainable roof and two other roofs providing amenity space. It was added that there would be vehicular access to the site but no through route.
- Members commented that the design of Omega B was welcomed.
- Some concerns were raised about the number of people that would be sharing bathrooms, health and safety issues, and the levels of natural light. It was noted by some members that they would not want this accommodation to have different standards to Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). It was explained by the applicant team that the bedrooms were designed for one person and that, although they could accommodate couples, only a very small number were used by couples. It was noted that the bedrooms would meet minimum standards for natural light and outlook. It was added that there were spacious communal areas and that the units were based on existing warehouse living sites. In relation to bathrooms, it was explained that this varied but that, at most, a bathroom would be shared by 1-3 people in the smaller units and 1-5 people in the larger units.
- It was noted that the site was within a Local Employment Area - Regeneration Area and that policy DM38 required developments to maximise employment floorspace. The applicant team noted that the proposal would double the commercial space and that this did not include the working areas within the warehouse living. It was added that there would be an increase in the number of residential units and that these would contribute to the viability of the affordable workspaces.

- Some members commented that the design of the balconies and the sawtooth element in the Omega B proposals appeared slightly overcrowded and it was enquired whether the balconies could be internalised. The applicant team explained that recessed and pop out balconies had been considered and that there were advantages and disadvantages to both designs. It was commented that recessed balconies generally had reduced natural light. It was considered that the current design worked well for the units whilst trying to retain and incorporate as much of original building as possible.
- It was clarified that the proposal did not include any cladding.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

11. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The Chair noted that, due to time constraints, this would be considered at the next meeting if required.

12. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Chair noted that, due to time constraints, this would be considered at the next meeting if required.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 6 September 2021.

Post-meeting note: the date of the next meeting was postponed until 14 September 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date