

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 2021, 7.10 - 10.05 PM

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

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 Gina Adamou. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Emine Ibrahim.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Yvonne Say noted that, as a Bounds Green ward councillor, she had attended site visits and officer briefings in relation to item 8, Land at the junction of Partridge Way and Trinity Road.

Councillor Liz Morris noted that, as a ward councillor, she had received a briefing from the owners of Highgate Care Ltd in relation to item 10, Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, N6.

6. MINUTES

Councillor Viv Ross noted that he had received an email from a local resident questioning the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting on 5 July 2021. The Head of Development Management noted that he had not seen this email but that he believed the minutes to be an accurate record. The Chair stated that she considered that the minutes were an accurate record of the meeting on 5 July 2021.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 5 July 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted.

8. HGY/2021/2075 - LAND AT THE JUNCTION OF PARTRIDGE WAY AND TRINITY ROAD, N22

The Committee considered an application for the redevelopment of the site comprising the demolition of existing garages and the erection of a nine-storey building to accommodate 23 residential units for council rent (Class C3); associated cycle and refuse/recycling storage facilities, accessible car parking spaces, and landscaping and public realm improvements including a children's play space; relocation of existing refuse/recycling facility.

Conor Guilfoyle, Planning Officer, introduced the report and highlighted that additional information relating to access, servicing, and waste; fire; Thames Water; and landscaping was set out in the addendum. The Planning Officer responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Head of Development Management explained that the application had been publicised in a number of ways; a press notice, letters, and site notice, but that, due to an administrative error, there had been a delay in the press notice being published. It was noted that the consultation would run until 23 September 2021. It was explained that, if any material objections were raised during this time, they would have to be considered and that the decision would not proceed if there were any material impacts on the decision.
- It was clarified that the sustainable transport initiatives referenced on page 8 of the agenda pack included measures such as the installation of bike stores and limits on parking.
- It was commented that, on page 36 of the agenda pack, the Conservation Officer had noted that there was a significant impact on the conservation area. It was confirmed that this should state that they considered that there was not a significant impact.
- It was confirmed that, on page 56 of the agenda pack, it should state that there would be 23 residential units, rather than eight.
- It was confirmed that the proposed building would be nine storeys and that the two existing tower blocks were both 15 storeys. The Planning Officer explained that the design approach was set out in the report and that planning policies now asked certain sites to be developed at higher density to meet housing demand.
- The Committee expressed some concerns that residents did not always use cycle stores due to security concerns. The Planning Officer commented that the proposal would have internal cycle storage that would be secure, weatherproof,

and accessible only by residents. The Committee noted these points in relation to this application but requested that a report on cycle stores be presented to the Strategic Planning Committee.

- In relation to play facilities, it was confirmed that there would be in excess of 10sqm of play space per child for residents of the new building. It was intended that this space would be used by children under 11 as there were other areas locally for older children; it was noted that the space on site would be available for existing residents as well as residents of the new building. It was added that the play space provided would exceed the level required by planning policy. It was also noted that there would also be biodiversity measures in this area but that these would be small and would not try to compete with the play space.
- In response to a question about the ability of buildings to accommodate hoists in wheelchair units, it was noted that this would be considered under the Building Regulations; although compliance would be required, this was assessed under a different process. The Committee acknowledged this but asked that a report on this issue be presented to the Strategic Planning Committee.
- In relation to a question about whether visitors would be able to obtain visitor parking vouchers, the Chair believed that these were now available, even where residents did not have a parking permit.
- It was noted in the report that there would be an improvement of 64% in carbon dioxide emissions. It was clarified that this related to the level of reduction for the new build over and above the requirements of Building Regulations rather than the replacement of the garages.
- The Committee enquired whether the development could be required to commence within two years rather than three. The Head of Development Management noted that this was a standard condition but that the Committee could put this question to the applicant and amend the condition.
- It was explained that the applicant for this scheme would make carbon offset contributions. These would go to the carbon offset community fund which would be spent on mitigation measures off site. It was suggested that a report on carbon offsetting could be provided to the Strategic Planning Committee.
- The Committee noted the comments of the Quality Review Panel (QRP) to ensure that the courtyard area did not become a waste storage area for residents. The Planning Officer noted that the measures to prevent this would include access to the area through a locked gate, additional surveillance provided by foot traffic, and a hard and soft landscaping scheme which would be subject to approval by the Local Planning Authority.
- The Committee welcomed the installation of stores for mobility scooters. It was enquired whether there could be additional visitor cycle parking and whether there was storage space for larger or cargo bikes. The Transport Planning Officer explained that the provision of two visitor cycle parking spaces met the London Plan policy for 5-40 dwellings. It was confirmed that larger or cargo bikes could be stored internally.
- Some members commented that the drawings of Bounds Green Road had additional green landscaping and that the visuals provided should be more representative of the area.
- Some members suggested that the building would be more appropriate with six storeys. The Planning Officer explained that, due to issues of housing demand, there was a need to maximise housing as much as possible, based on a design-

led approach, and that officers considered that the proposals could be accommodated on the site.

The Chair noted that, at her discretion, the Committee would hear from three objectors in relation to this application. They would have three minutes each to present their views to the Committee and then the applicant would have nine minutes to speak.

Jack Grant spoke in objection to the application. He noted that, in the pre-application consultation, there had been 28 responses, with 26 negative responses and no responses in favour. He stated that a number of the concerns raised had not been addressed in the application, including issues such as the location of bin stores. He commented that the report stated that light levels would not be adversely affected but highlighted that domestic windows would be losing 62% of their light and that the playground would be losing 44% of its light. He added that the playground would be dark in January and December. Jack Grant explained that he would like to raise a point of order. He drew attention to the planning protocol, which stated that objectors would be able to speak against an application, and enquired why the applicant would be given equal time to address the Committee. Ed Telepneff, Legal Advisor, noted that the applicant had a right to respond and that the applicant would be given the same amount of time as objectors; it was explained that this was the Council's protocol.

Paul Burnham spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the visual impact of placing housing blocks so close together was problematic and that, with a distance of 15 metres, the outlook would be foreboding. He commented that the proposal was incompatible with the typology of area, which was primarily built pre-1939. He noted that overlooking was an issue in several directions, particularly between Finsbury House and the proposed block. He stated that this would impact privacy which was a major quality of life issue. He added that there would be a loss of light and that the new building was inappropriately situated directly south of the two existing blocks and play cabin. He commented that the first and second floors of Newbury House would have a 20% reduction in light and that the play cabin would lose 18% of total sunlight hours and 38% of winter sunlight hours. He asked for the proposed height of the building to be reconsidered. He stated that dense housing developments were not good for future residents and asked that residents were treated with more respect and asked the applicant to look at the proposal again. He added that the Committee should not make a decision while the consultation was still in progress.

Malgan Grech spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he objected to the height and space of the proposal and that the closeness and overshadowing made the application unreasonable. He commented that there would be a loss of privacy, light, and peace due to the scale, position, and height of the proposed building. He stated that the area had a shortage of parking already and that motorbike parking was not mentioned. He commented that the application would result in diminished quality of life and more social problems which had not been taken into account. He did not believe that the proposals respected the scale and context of the area and he felt that the building would have an unattractive design which was out of character in the area. In relation to his property, he noted that the proposal would remove the view from his balcony, would result in light loss, would diminish the value of his property, and would mean that he had no parking or bulk storage.

At 8.14pm, the Committee had a brief adjournment to rectify some technical issues for those joining and watching the meeting remotely. The meeting resumed at 8.16pm.

The objectors responded to questions from the Committee:

- In response to a question about alternative proposals, Paul Burnham noted that different objectors would have different views but stated that the number of homes proposed in the area was excessive and that the design was not acceptable. He commented that the loss of light and access proposed was unacceptable. It was noted that residents supported the provision of council homes but that more thought was required for the proposals.
- In response to a question about the loss of light, Paul Burnham stated that the Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards denied light access to people that they should be reasonably entitled to. He added that residents did not think that the loss of light would be appropriate.

Christian Pinchin, applicant team, addressed the Committee. Christian Pinchin stated that they were making use of an under used site in a highly accessible location. It was noted that, through the QRP and pre-application process, the design of the proposal had evolved based on the advice given. The applicant team felt that they had consulted widely through a programme of community engagement. They considered that the building proposed was the best solution for brief which made use of a tight brownfield site whilst respecting its location. It was noted that there would be three units per floor which was considered to be efficient and to provide good gross floor space. It was explained that the site had a unique, triangular shape and the applicant considered that the proposal provided a modern and unique response which minimised direct overlooking to the adjacent properties. It was considered that the design was elegant, complemented the surroundings, and used modern materials to layer the façades with visually interesting components. It was noted that the proposals delivered an optimum number of units, a 64% carbon dioxide reduction, an energy efficient building, complied with policies, and provided 23 high quality, affordable units.

In relation to some queries raised by objectors and councillors, the applicant team noted that it was noted that the building would have a reinforced, concrete frame with inherent strengths in the structure which would be able to accommodate hoists and disabled access. In relation to possible dumping in the side yard, it was noted that the area would have secure access gates and CCTV and would be naturally policed by foot traffic. Regarding sunlight and daylight, it was explained that the building had been analysed using BRE guidance and was considered to be acceptable. It was noted that there were some impacts but that, on balance, it accorded with the regulations.

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

- It was enquired whether the proposal could have a lower number of storeys. The applicant team considered that a design with nine storeys created a more slim profile, especially when viewed from Bounds Green Road, and that the building would look blockier with six storeys. It was added that a nine storey building would provide a more optimal number of social housing units.
- The Committee asked how many rooms would be affected in terms of daylight, sunlight, and overlooking and whether there was any non-compliance. The

applicant team explained that it was very rare that a building in London had no impact on its neighbours. It was noted that there had been detailed analysis and that the professional report considered the proposal to be compliant. In relation to overlooking, it was explained that the building had been designed so that, as much as possible, the habitable rooms faced primarily south, sometimes east or west, and rarely north to avoid the existing blocks. It was added that a small proportion of rooms were significantly affected.

The Committee discussed the proposed conditions:

- It was noted that condition 17 should be corrected to read 23 residential units.
- The applicant confirmed that they were content for condition 1 to require development to commence within two years, rather than three years. The Committee agreed that condition 1 should be amended to require development to commence within two years.
- It was agreed that a condition should be included to state that no satellite dishes should be attached to the building. The Head of Development Management noted that the standard wording in relation to satellite dishes could be included and that this condition would be included with appropriate numbering.
- It was noted that there were some changes to conditions set out in the addendum. It was commented that there were two sections titled 'condition 6'. The Head of Development Management confirmed that all conditions would be numbered consecutively.

The Committee noted that the consultation period for this application was still open and enquired what would happen if there were further objections. Ed Telepneff, Legal Advisor, explained that, if any material objections were received and the issue had not been considered or addressed, it would not be advisable for permission to be issued. He noted that the new objections should then be considered by the Committee and the application should be reheard, taking the issues into account.

Cllr Rice suggested that it would be appropriate to wait until the outcome of the consultation before the Committee considered the application. Cllr Rice moved to defer consideration of the application until after the close of the consultation process; this was seconded by Cllr Say. There were 4 votes in favour of the motion to defer and 5 votes against the motion to defer. The motion was not passed.

Following a vote with 6 votes in favour and 3 votes against, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of an agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below following the expiry of the consultation by way of press notice on 23rd September without any new material representations.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

3. That the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 14th October or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of the report, the addendum to the report, and the agreed amendments noted by the Committee above).

Cllr Ibrahim did not take part in the voting for this item as she was not present for the full item.

9. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

10. PRE/2020/0138 - MARY FEILDING GUILD CARE HOME, 103-107 NORTH HILL, N6

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and redevelopment to provide a new nursing and convalescence home of 70 beds with support facilities, a wellbeing and physiotherapy centre and associated works.

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

- In response to a question about the distance between buildings, the applicant team drew attention to the site location plan which showed the footprints of the existing and proposed buildings. It was explained that there had been an attempt to move the boundaries away from neighbouring properties and sensitive areas and some other areas where the footprint had been extended.
- It was noted that the site previously accommodated a 42 bed residential care home and that the proposal would be a different business model for short term stays after hospital treatment. The Committee enquired how this would meet Policy DM15, which preserved specialist housing. The Head of Development Management noted that the previous and proposed uses concerned two different types of specialist housing and that this would need to be assessed and weighed to determine whether the proposal was acceptable.
- Attention was drawn to the comments of the Quality Review Panel (QRP). It was noted that the site was located near a row of Georgian town houses and it was queried whether the current utilitarian design had the right architectural quality for the area. Further design work? The applicant team noted that they had rigorously assessed the site and its context in planning, architectural, and heritage terms over

the last year. It was added that views had been collected from residents and local amenity groups and the applicant team considered that the current proposal had an appropriate design context for the area. It was also noted that officers and the QRP also considered the design to be appropriate but that the applicant would continue to engage on the progression of the design.

- Some concerns were expressed that the North Hill frontage was not visually attractive or complementary to the Georgian terrace. It was also enquired how demolition was justified. The Head of Development Management explained that the applicant would need to show that they could meet the requirements for specialist housing and that the replacement building would be equal to or better than the existing building in terms of enhancing the conservation area. The applicant team added that they had considered retaining and repurposing the building but that it was not practical or financially viable.
- It was noted that the QRP had criticised the location of the restaurant in the basement. The applicant team explained that the restaurant would now be located on the ground floor and would be overlooking the rear garden.
- It was confirmed that 10 rooms would be north facing which constituted a small number of the total rooms.
- The Committee noted that this application was quite different to a standard planning application and requested that the final report contained additional information about the specific considerations for this type of decision, including information about affordable provision and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions.
- It was noted that there were a number of landmarks near to the site, including Grade II Listed and locally listed buildings. The Committee requested that the images for the final application included these details so that they could be seen in context to the proposals.
- It was noted that the QRP had referred to the climate emergency. It was commented that this was a large site which could have a significant benefit or detriment and it was requested that as much detail as possible was provided in the application. The applicant team explained that they had appointed a sustainability and renewable energy consultant who had already been in contact with the council's climate officer and agreed a scope of works and information requirements to support the application.
- In response to a question about the description of the development as 'special needs housing', the applicant team stated that this would be Class C2 residential use. It was explained that Policy DM15 was supportive of special needs accommodation and that the proposal would meet a special need for residential accommodation. It was added that, as part of the council's policy, there were sub-criteria which indicated the type of facilities that would be relevant and which would be applicable in this case; this included the level of supervision, management, and care/ support.
- Cllr Peacock noted that the applicant team should use the phrase 'older person' rather than 'elderly'.
- It was clarified that each floor of the building would have a communal area. It was noted that all rooms would have en suite facilities. It was added that the previous rooms were approximately 10sqm and that the new rooms would all be in excess of 20sqm.

- It was enquired whether the windowless room shown on the plan would be for staff and whether they would be sleeping in this room. The applicant team noted that this was planned to be a state of the art facility and that the area mentioned would possibly be a rest area for staff; it was added that the internal configuration might still change and that the rest area might move upstairs.
- The applicant team noted that the estimated cost of staying at the facility would be £300 per night.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

At 9.20pm, the Committee agreed a short adjournment; the meeting resumed at 9.25pm.

11. PRE/2021/0011 - ARUNDEL COURT AND BALDEWYNE COURT, LANSDOWNE ROAD,N17

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for proposals seek to deliver 30 new homes in five buildings fronting Lansdowne Road at Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court.

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

- It was enquired whether the applicant team had considered building additional flats on top of the existing buildings to reduce the potential impact and retain the garages. The applicant team noted that this had been considered but that there were a number of issues, including cost implications, funding arrangements, and complications with the tenants and leaseholders in the existing buildings. It was explained that the project brief had been to build new homes on new council owned sites. It was noted that building on top of existing properties was not part of the current programme but that the council was considering this as a possible option in the longer term.
- In relation to parking, the Planning Officer explained that a parking stress survey had been undertaken which indicated that there was sufficient capacity. It was noted that 18 of the 33 spaces at Arundel Court would be retained and 13 of the 30 spaces at Baldewyne Court would be retained; in total, there would be a loss of 32 spaces.
- The Committee asked about the tenure mix of the proposals and noted that a number of people would not be eligible for council housing. It was enquired whether it was possible to bring forward a mixed tenure scheme. The applicant team explained that the funding from the Mayor of London was to deliver new council affordable rental property and that this was why sites had been identified to optimise the number and types of housing to respond to housing need. It was acknowledged that this application would only provide one or two bed units but it was highlighted that there were other schemes which would provide larger family units. It was explained that the site was a narrow strip of land and that, due to the space requirements for family units, it was better suited to one and two bed units.
- It was also confirmed that the applicant was looking to enhance the external amenities, including new landscaping and play space, new planting, bike stores, and refuse and recycling stores. It was noted that the focus was on external areas as Homes for Haringey had scheduled internal upgrade works.

- It was noted that the application proposed a number of small courtyards and there were concerns that these might be sources of anti-social behaviour. The applicant team explained that these areas would be better overlooked and landscaped to ensure that they were safe and were not a source of nuisance. It was noted that the applicant was liaising with Secured by Design and it was anticipated that the proposals would be gold rated.
- Some members stated that the design of the proposal was unattractive, that local authority schemes should be exemplars, and that the design should be readdressed.
- The Committee noted that the windows in the proposed blocks seemed to directly overlook the existing blocks and that some bedrooms would only be separated by 2.5 metres. The applicant team explained that the gable ends contained slot windows for the hallways but that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had suggested that there was room for improvement and this would be considered. It was noted that it might be possible to move the blocks to improve the relationship between buildings.
- It was noted that the QRP had recommended the provision of lifts in the new building which would provide for long term occupation based on mobility. The applicant team noted that this had been considered but that lifts were very expensive to install and maintain. It was explained that this would not be possible as the scheme would not provide enough units to ensure that the cost was viable.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The Chair noted that, due to time constraints, this would be considered at the next meeting if required. It was added that any queries could be addressed to the Head of Development Management.

13. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Chair noted that, due to time constraints, this would be considered at the next meeting if required. It was added that any queries could be addressed to the Head of Development Management.

14. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 4 October 2021.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank