

# **MINUTES OF PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 6TH DECEMBER, 2021, 7.00 - 9.25 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Julia Ogiehor, Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross, and Councillor Yvonne Say.

**In attendance:** Councillor Bob Hare, Highgate ward councillor

## **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, Councillor Emine Ibrahim, and Councillor Liz Morris.

Councillor Julia Ogiehor was present as substitute for Councillor Liz Morris.

## **4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison noted that he would be speaking as a ward councillor in relation to item 8, HGY/2021/2718 - Stanhope Road Bridge, Stanhope Road, N6 5DE. He confirmed that he would not be taking part in the discussion or voting on this item and would leave the room after his submission, whilst the application was being discussed.

## **6. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 1 November 2021 and 8 November 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/2021/2718 - STANHOPE ROAD BRIDGE, STANHOPE ROAD, N6 5DE**

*Cllr Cawley-Harrison moved to the public seating area.*

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a new footbridge with associated ramp, stepped access, and landscaping, involving demolition of the existing bridge.

Laurence Ackrill, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- The Committee enquired about the heritage significance of the Victorian railway bridge. The Principal Conservation Officer explained that there were different levels of designation and that this structure had local, not national importance, and was a non-designated heritage asset. It was noted that the bridge had symbolic value but had been significantly altered over time and had lost some of its character. It was also noted that the bridge needed to be used regularly by a number of users and that the retention of the existing bridge would have serious health and safety implications. It was highlighted that the most important heritage asset for the site was the conservation area, which was a nationally designated heritage asset, and that the loss of the bridge would secure better and safer use of the conservation area.
- In relation to the location of the ramp, it was noted that seven additional areas had been considered. It was explained that the slope and topography of Stanhope Road meant that it was not considered viable to locate the ramp in the northwest corner of the site. It was added that the applicant might be able to provide further information about this process.

Cathy Meeus spoke in objection to the application. She stated that she did not object to the replacement of the bridge but was objecting to the loss of green space, the location of the ramp, and the significant destruction of trees and vegetation. It was noted that the Friends of the Parkland Walk challenged the use of this location for new entrance infrastructure, particularly in the context of climate change and biodiversity policies. It was stated that the council had failed to review alternative access options and had not provided these options as part of the consultations with other groups, including wheelchair users. Cathy Meeus added that the Friends of the Parkland Walk position had been supported in a petition signed by 450 people. It was suggested that the accesses at Holmesdale Road, Blythwood Road, and Oxford Road could be upgraded and would provide better accessible entrance options. It was also proposed that a long access path could be included on the southwest of the site, with wheelchair access provided elsewhere.

Cathy Meeus commented that the experts involved in judging the suitability of the proposal were part of the council or the applicant team and were not independent. It was also stated that the Planning Sub Committee had visited the site but it was felt that objectors should have been present to provide an alternative view. It was added that the proposals were considered to be in conflict with several key policies and that planting replacement trees offsite did not address the loss of trees in Parkland Walk.

Giovanna Iozzi spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the council had a net zero goal for carbon emissions and that mature trees should be valued. It was noted that, following some recent works in Parkland Walk, a significant number of trees had been lost. She noted that there were a number of benefits to preserving trees, including flood prevention, absorption of carbon dioxide, animal habitats, and soil filtering. It was stated that Parkland Walk was not a park but was a corridor and nature reserve and it was felt that it should have a special degree of care. It was commented that, as a result of the proposal, several mature trees would be removed, including the locally loved oak, the 'monster tree'. Attention was drawn to the strength of public feeling against this application and it was highlighted that the provision of street trees would not be an appropriate replacement.

It was noted that Haringey Council had stated that a five metre area around the entrances to the bridge should be kept clear of trees but it was questioned whether this was based on any ecological advice. It was stated that other boroughs were providing better ecological protection, such as the Tower Hamlets green bridge to replace connecting roads to Mile End Park. Giovanna Iozzi commented that the biodiversity net gain figures were flawed and that the habitat survey had been undertaken out of the optimal season. It was asked that the current proposal was rejected and replaced with a more creative and forward thinking alternative. It was suggested that the council should work with specialist ecologists in order to put nature at the centre of the designs.

Cllr Hare spoke in objection to the application. He queried the choice of the footpath route on the southeast side of the site. It was noted that a gently sloping path up the bank, which was already informally marked by people using this route, would be a suitable alternative and would allow oak 105 to be retained. It was added that the oak, alongside the high wall abutting the cottage, would prevent viewing both into and out of the cottage; Cllr Hare stated that he had pursued this suggestion with the officer but this had not been accepted. It was noted that the briefings to councillors did not include this option or the option on the southwest corner.

In relation to biodiversity, Cllr Hare queried the accuracy of the suggestion that habitat units would increase by 13.04% and noted that all information provided should be carefully examined. It was queried whether disability compliance was required and how this was balanced against the damage to the park; it was also enquired whether any demand analysis had been undertaken with disability organisations. Cllr Hare stated that the proposals were very unpopular locally and he suggested three conditions. Firstly, he asked that a report was provided on the two gently sloping path options. If this suggestion was impractical, he asked that a report was provided on a combination of stepped access between the landings of the proposed zigzag path to obviate the need for the southwest corner path. Cllr Hare also requested that native

ivy be planted on the wing walls to deter graffiti, benefit biodiversity, and for visual greening, in addition to the proposed planting.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison spoke in objection to the application. He explained that trees were routinely cut down but that the level of objection in this case was unique which demonstrated the significance of these mature trees, particularly the oak which could be classified as a Grade A tree. He noted that the council had declared a climate emergency in 2019 which included the protection of trees, biodiversity, and unique green spaces such as Parkland Walk. In addition to the removal of trees, Cllr Cawley-Harrison stated that the designs were still flawed. It was noted that the design included an urbanised, concrete ramp which would replace the existing, natural-style steps and which would not be sympathetic to the surroundings. It was felt that the design process provided little consideration of alternative designs to mitigate the issues raised by objectors, such as a longer access path in top left quadrant, southeast quadrant, an access point beyond the formal outline of the development, or an access path underneath and within the bridge.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison stated that the bridge surface would be made of concrete and extend far beyond the bridge at a level higher than the existing path and would put further trees in jeopardy of removal. He noted that this would result in the loss of five additional trees and, although this was mentioned in the tree report, it was noted mentioned in the committee report. It was commented that the report explained that the oak and its root plate would be at risk due to this surfacing but it was stated that this was specific to the proposed surfacing and could be mitigated with vaulted surface or grid filter. Cllr Cawley-Harrison asked the Committee to refuse the application based on its failure to comply with policy DM19 and the strength of residents' views.

In response to the points raised in the objections and subsequent questions, the following responses were provided:

- In relation to the question of whether disability compliance was necessary or whether it could be provided offsite, the Head of Development Management noted that both the applicant and the Local Planning Authority had equalities obligations. It was stated that there were strong policy presumptions in favour of providing accessibility.
- Cathy Meeus stated that there were three alternative areas where useful wheelchair access could be provided and could give meaningful access to Parkland Walk, rather than a high specification ramp.
- Some members of the Committee enquired whether wheelchair access at the alternative locations would also need to be built to the same specifications as the proposed ramp. Cathy Meeus commented that the alternative locations mentioned had a more amenable gradient and location and would result in less destruction of trees and green space.
- It was noted that the oak tree, or monster tree, was covered in Russian vine and it was queried whether the tree would survive in several years. The Principal Tree and Conservation Manager explained that Russian vine did not kill trees but it did suppress their growth and degrade their quality and health. It was commented that the oak tree was covered in the vine which had caused branches to come out of the tree top sporadically and it was not considered that the tree was in good

health. It was added that, if the tree was to be retained, the vine would need to be completely removed and the tree would need to be monitored.

*At this point, Cllr Cawley-Harrison left the room.*

Simon Farrow, applicant team, addressed the Committee. He explained that extensive studies had revealed that the current bridge structure was unsuitable and every effort had been made to ensure that the new bridge design responded to the local environment and local needs. It was noted that there had been pre-application conversations with the council, councillors, and local groups which had informed the simple but attractive design. It was stated that the proposal had a sustainable design with a 120 year life expectancy and would maximise the public realm, including accessibility and useability.

It was explained that several options had been studied against the set criteria and an assessment had concluded that the current proposal was the most suitable and would improve access for all, including wheelchair users. Simon Farrow acknowledged the concerns and objections raised, particularly the loss of trees but it was stated that a balance had to be struck between the need to replace the bridge, design standards for ramps and steps, and the protection of biodiversity. It was noted that the mature oak would be removed due to its proximity to the bridge and the resulting change in levels. However, it was explained that the proposal would concentrate the access works and minimise the impacts of development on other trees. It was added that the landscaping designs would result in a 10% net gain in biodiversity and would provide additional street trees and it was considered that the development would increase biodiversity overall.

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

- In relation to the options explored for the access ramp, Sam Neal, Project Manager, stated that multiple options had been assessed. It was highlighted that there was an evaluation matrix for this assessment which was informed by the results of a public consultation in 2020. It was noted that sustainability and biodiversity had been allocated additional weighting based on the results of this consultation. It was added that the issues considered as part of the assessment included overlooking, personal safety, natural surveillance, and the potential conflict between those cycling and walking. Sam Neal noted that multiple options were considered but that, in a number of locations, the topography of the land meant that the zigzag path or ramps required would have involved removing an excessive number of trees. It was added that, due to the location of the T105 oak tree, it was already affected by the construction of the bridge and the proposal therefore minimised the impact on trees and provided improved accessibility.
- It was confirmed that it was planned to retain the felled oak tree on site for other uses, such as a natural barrier to prevent footpath degradation and to improve biodiversity and to create a natural habitat.

Following a vote with 6 votes in favour and 2 votes against, it was

**RESOLVED**

To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives.

*Cllr Cawley-Harrison did not take part in the voting and re-entered the room at the end of the item.*

**9. HGY/2020/3186 - UNIT 7, UNICORN WORKS, 21-25 GARMAN ROAD, N17 0UN**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two-storey replacement light industrial unit.

It was noted that there had been a final revision to the parking which had been included in the addendum that was circulated to the Committee and published online.

Tania Skelli, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was noted that there were expected to be 18 employees across the units and it was enquired why 36 long stay cycle units were proposed. It was also noted that there appeared to be some discussion about parking and it was enquired how the number of parking spaces had been calculated. It was commented that, as the units would be separate, it was unlikely that the unit occupiers would be able to co-ordinate service deliveries.
- The Head of Development Management explained that there had been a previous building on site and an established position so there had been a balance between the applicant's expectation on floor space and modernising the standards and layout. The Transport Planning Officer noted that the existing parking arrangements were quite congested and that work had been undertaken with the applicant to agree on a layout that worked well and complied with the London Plan parking standards. It was explained that the proposal was to have three loading bays to respond to the needs of the development and two parking spaces.
- In relation to parking, Mr Upadhyay, applicant, stated that he had occupied unit 3 on the site for 20 years. He noted that it had been possible to park four cars in front of the unit if required so there was potentially room for 12 parking spaces across the front of the units.
- It was highlighted that the completion date for the section 106 legal agreement, noted in part 3 of the recommendations, should read 18/01/2022 rather than 18/01/2021.
- The Head of Development Management stated that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, the amended drawing, and the amendment of the date relating to the completion of the section 106 legal agreement from 2021 to 2022.

Following a vote, 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 a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning 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 section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 18/01/2022 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in 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 (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
5. Not applicable.
6. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons.
  1. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan 2017 Policies SP8 and SP9.*
  2. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure planning obligations for mitigation measures to promote sustainable transport, by reason of its lack of travel plan would significantly exacerbate pressure for onstreet parking spaces in surrounding streets, prejudicing the encouragement of alternative transport modes and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to SP7 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.*
  3. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and/or financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI2 and SI 4 of the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.*
  4. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a construction management plan, by reason of its lack of measures to ensure the*

*free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway and would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies SP7 of the Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM13 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.*

7. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (6) 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.

## **10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS**

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

## **11. PPA-2021-0022 - ASHLEY ROAD DEPOT, ASHLEY ROAD, LONDON, N17 9LZ**

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide approx. 275 new dwellings (min. 50% for social rent) in buildings of between four and thirteen storeys, two commercial units, 41 car parking spaces, new pedestrian/cycle routes, landscaping and public realm improvements.

Cllr Rice noted that the land in this case was owned by Haringey Council and enquired whether it was a conflict of interest for the case officer to be a member of Haringey Council staff. He stated that it would be better for the case to be presented by an external person. The Head of Development Management noted that the case officer would present the case and then the applicant team would deliver a 15 minute presentation on the application; this was an accepted position where the applicant was the council.

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

- It was confirmed that pitched roofs were no longer proposed within the application.
- It was noted that the site had a sunken petrol tank to service vehicles and it was enquired what measures would be taken to ensure that the land was uncontaminated. The applicant team noted that the previous owner had only recently vacated the site and that, after the proper studies had been undertaken,



further information would be reported back to the Committee. It was added that there was provision in the cost plan for decontamination.

- The applicant team explained that the existing wall around the north and west of the site would be taken down, except for some sections of the wall which would be retained in order to preserve existing trees. It was explained that this would create some new public realm to replace the existing, narrow, concrete path.
- It was noted that the council owned the land and it was enquired whether 100% social housing could be provided. The applicant team stated that about 62.5% of the habitable rooms would provide social housing. It was explained that this scheme also provided larger, family, social housing units which met an important need in Haringey but that this made it more challenging to meet the required levels of financial viability.
- In relation to amenity, it was enquired whether Down Lane Park would be counted towards the amenity in the application as a number of developments in the area had used the park in their amenity calculations. The applicant team explained that the proposal would meet the required standards for playspace on the site, including integrating play into the landscape, and it was important that the site worked well for the community. It was added that there was a desire for the residents to use and activate the park as well.
- The applicant team confirmed that the relevant child density calculations had been undertaken and this would inform the play strategy. It was also clarified that there were three, communal, amenity spaces which were located in areas A and B, as well as in the podium garden at first floor level, above the integrated parking in Building C. It was added that all family homes would have a private amenity space as front and rear gardens. It was also noted that there would be amenity space in the routes around the site, including greening of the route and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) rain gardens. It was commented that there was no intention to have amenity on roof tops but these areas would likely have solar panels and air source heat pumps.
- In relation to refuse, it was noted that the applicant team had carefully considered movement across the site and had produced vehicular movement and refuse movement diagrams. It was explained that there would be refuse storage in each building to reduce any issues with refuse across the landscape of the site. As part of the refuse strategy, it was explained that refuse lorries would be able to access the roads within the site, via collapsible bollards, for collections.
- The report suggested that the social rent units would have deck access and members expressed concerns about the safety of this. The applicant team noted that there would be limited use of deck access to serve approximately four doors but these would enable the scheme to achieve dual aspect for the units.
- In relation to tenure distribution, it was explained that there was a mix of social rented and market sale homes throughout the site but that all units would be delivered to the same quality. It was added that the social rented units were generally the family homes which were in the lower rise buildings and reflected the homes on the other side of the street. It was explained that this worked better for management and maintenance but also for the families themselves.
- The Committee asked about the safeguarded waste site. It was noted that the Ashley Road Depot had been closed as part of a strategic decision on waste management and that the small recycling facility had been relocated to the Western Road facility near Alexandra Palace.

- It was enquired whether any of the blocks had mixed tenure. The applicant team explained that, purely from a service charge perspective, individual floors generally did not have mixed tenures. In this scheme, the taller buildings were generally for outright sale and these would require more maintenance and lift access which would result in additional service charges. It was added that all of the communal and social spaces were shared.
- Some members noted that other applications on council land had proposed 100% social rent. It was enquired whether the sale of homes would be funding the development and whether it would be possible to provide additional intermediate units to have a better, overall blend of tenures. The applicant team noted that there would be some subsidy from the sale of homes on site. It was accepted that additional intermediate units could be provided but it was noted that this was a matter of judgement and would reduce the number of larger, family homes.
- It was noted that the Committee had previously expressed concerns about shared pedestrian and vehicle streets as they were considered to be unsafe. The applicant team explained that this area was primarily a space for cyclists and pedestrians but that some vehicular access was required for disabled parking and essential vehicle access. It was noted that there would be bollards and the surface would not be fully shared between cars and other users; it was considered to be a safe route and the applicant was discussing the details with the Highways Team.
- In relation to a query about the wider facilities, such as schools and GPs, the applicant team understood that some provision was being developed in the area but it was noted that this would form part of the considerations for the main application.
- It was noted that there was reference to a 'special building' and it was enquired what this would contain. The applicant team explained that this building was considered to be special as it was located in a prominent position near the park and on a main thoroughfare. The exact nature of the ground floor was a work in progress but it was anticipated that it would be a space for community use, such as a café or shop.
- Some members noted that it was important to encourage active travel and suggested that fewer car parking spaces could be provided by the scheme.
- It was enquired whether any changes had been made following the initial feedback from community engagement. The applicant team noted that a number of amendments had been made in response to comments, including some reductions in scale and massing and the movement of the five storey building deeper within the site. There had also been some feedback about the non-residential uses which the applicant team would try to bring forward.
- In relation to the pathway from the area to the Tottenham Marshes, the applicant team explained that this was outside of the site boundary and was not within the scope of the application. It was noted that the applicant team wished to influence improvements in the area and were working closely with the Regeneration Team who were looking at the wider area.
- The applicant team confirmed that the building in the southeast of the site was due to be demolished as part of the scheme. It was noted that the building was not locally listed and would be difficult to retain as it was set back from the street. It was commented that the materials from the building would be re-used within the public realm on site.

- The Committee enquired about the standard of Passive House and London Energy Transformation Initiative (LETI) credentials. The applicant team explained that testing was currently underway and that the design of the buildings was crucial to obtaining Passive House certification. It was noted that there was a need to undertake additional testing in response to any design changes. It was also commented that finalising the orientation of the buildings would be the first priority and then the building fabric would be considered. It was noted that there would be triple glazing and that the southern facades would have additional glazing to optimise compliance with Passive House.
- The Committee suggested that it would be useful to clarify the diagram which showed the distribution of council homes and market sale homes as the existing grid suggested that the buildings had mixed tenures; it was suggested that additional block names or letters could be used.
- It was noted that there was a policy to give priority for council homes to local residents within 250 metres. The applicant team stated that there were no known council tenants within this area. It was believed that priority would then be given to existing tenants and wheelchair users but that the detail of the policy would have to be confirmed.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

## **12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

Cllr Ogiehor stated that a number of residents had expressed concerns about Cranwood House (HGY/2021/2727) in relation to the size of the proposal and its protrusion onto Muswell Hill Road. It was enquired whether these concerns had been taken into account in the amended proposals. The Head of Development Management stated that there had been no substantial amendments since the application had been submitted but that this would be a question for the applicant team. It was noted that the application was currently being assessed and was likely to be presented to the Planning Sub Committee in January.

### **RESOLVED**

To note the report.

## **13. 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.

**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 10 January 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....