

MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 10TH JANUARY, 2022, 7.20 - 9.55 PM

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

In attendance: Councillor Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making, and Development.

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.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 8, HGY/2021/2031 – Wood Green Social Club, 3 & 4 Stuart Crescent, N22 5NJ, Councillor Peter Mitchell noted that two residents had approached him about the application. He explained that he had made it clear that he could not comment but agreed to request that the application be considered by the Planning Sub Committee. Councillor Peter Mitchell would be taking part in the discussion and voting on this item.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 6 December 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/2021/2031 - WOOD GREEN SOCIAL CLUB, 3 & 4 STUART CRESCENT, N22 5NJ

The Committee considered an application for the partial demolition of rear extensions and construction of 5 x part two, part three storey mews dwellings. Demolition of three storey front projection, demolition and re-construction of existing 2nd floor of 'Social Club' building and change of use of first floor from Community use to C3 (Residential) with balcony areas and internal re-configuration of existing 5 no. residential units within 3 & 4 Stuart Crescent and creation of an additional 9 no. residential units with associated landscaping works and parking.

Matthew Gunning, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to the storeys proposed, it was noted that unit 5 would be single storey and the remaining units would be between two and four storeys. It was added that the bulk of the proposals had been minimised during the application period.
- In relation to the distance between the proposal and the existing properties on Ewart Grove, the Planning Officer commented that the distances varied slightly depending on where measurements were taken from but were between 19.5m and 20.5m. It was acknowledged that this would be a close relationship but it was considered to be acceptable in an urban context.
- It was queried whether the height of the wall at the rear of the Social Club would be higher or lower than the existing building. The Planning Officer noted that the heights depended on where the measurements were taken due to the variation of the ground level and the heights of different sections of the proposal. It was explained that, because the wings of the proposed building were angled downwards, or chamfered, and the main form was further from the boundary, the resulting relationship was considered to be acceptable.
- In relation to the proposed mews house known as Mews 5, the Planning Officer noted that the existing wall was 3.4m high and that the proposed wall would be 6.4m high in total. It was explained that the aspect had been changed during the application process to minimise the bulk of the proposal, particularly in relation to 13 Ewart Grove. It was explained that the garden was considered to be sufficiently deep to mitigate the impact of the wall.
- It was noted that the locally listed building did not have statutory protection but that the changes would be modest. It was commented that a low wall and soft landscaping would also be introduced at the front of the building and that large structure to the rear of the building would be removed; these were considered to improve the appearance of the building.
- It was confirmed that the bin storage area on site would be for all units, including the mews houses and the semi-detached element.

- In relation to parking, it was clarified that it was proposed for the scheme to be car free as there was considered to be capacity in the area. It was stated that paragraph 6.69 of the report should state that it was **not** considered unreasonable to request that car parking permits be restricted by the applicant entering into a section 106 agreement for that purpose. It was added that the council's policies sought to minimise car use as much as possible and that the threshold set out in the Parking Policy for car free developments was four additional units.

Aneesha Noonan spoke in objection to the application. She explained that she was a resident of Ewart Grove and lived in a property that would be directly affected. She stated that she supported redevelopment of the site but expressed concerns that there was no commitment to social or affordable housing and did not feel that the report addressed the concerns that had been raised in relation to loss of privacy, amenity, massing, and density of occupation from the mews houses. It was considered that the proposals did not comply with Policy DM1 as they would not ensure that there was an appropriate amount of privacy for neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking, loss of privacy, and detriment to amenity.

Aneesha Noonan expressed specific concerns in relation to the design of mews houses 3 and 4 which were proposed to have three storeys above ground. It was acknowledged that there would be a 1.45m screen but it was not believed that this would prevent overlooking. It was considered that the drawing was unrealistic and appeared to be measured from the living room window rather than terrace itself. It was noted that residents would be able to look into the windows and gardens of properties on Ewart Grove and it was suggested that either the screens were too low or that the building heights were excessive. It was added that 1.7m high, sandblasted, glazed panels were proposed to protect privacy from second floor bedroom windows but it was asked that this condition be preserved in perpetuity to prevent overlooking and so that the glazing could not be changed by future residents. Aneesha Noonan also noted that the Construction Management Plan did mention any protection for gardens and boundaries during demolition and construction or any responsibility for repairs necessary as a result.

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

- In relation to overlooking, the Head of Development Management explained that this had been assessed from both the windows and the terraces and it was considered that sufficient safeguards were in place. It was noted that the suggested condition for the 1.7m high panels would not be unacceptable to supplement condition 11. The Committee agreed that a condition to require obscured glazing be included and that this should be excluded from permitted development rights.
- It was explained that any issues of damage during construction were covered under the Party Wall Act and this would be a civil dispute which was outside of the remit of the planning regime.
- In relation to affordable housing, it was explained that there would be an additional floorspace of 800sqm and that the threshold for securing affordable housing was 1,000sqm.

Glyn Emrys (Emrys Architects), applicant team, addressed the Committee. It was stated that the applicant had tried to create a balance that worked well for the site and for everyone. It was noted that the ground varied and that there had been some confusion about the storey heights as the existing building was higher than a storey. It was highlighted that the design of the proposal on the north side of existing houses had been careful to ensure that sufficient light would be provided to existing houses and that the applicant was trying to be sensitive with the design and screening proposed. In relation to parking, it was added that the applicant would like to keep the car parking arrangements as proposed in paragraph 6.69 of the report. It was also noted that there would be a small level of additional area which would amount to 1,150 square feet.

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

- In relation to a question about whether it would be possible to provide adaptations for the mews houses, Glyn Emrys stated that houses would always be able to be adapted but that this would be a question of when and to what degree, particularly if buildings were Listed or locally listed.

Cllr Mitchell moved to reject the application on the grounds that it did not comply with Policy DM1 and London Plan Policy D6 as it did not relate positively to neighbouring properties, would result in a loss of privacy and overlooking, and would be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing. It was also noted that, under Policy DM7, this was partly a backland site, would not safeguard privacy and amenity for surrounding houses, and would not have any street frontage. It was added that the proposal would also result in harm to the conservation area. As it was not seconded, the motion was not passed.

The Head of Development Management confirmed the recommendations and the amended conditions as follows:

11. Prior to occupation the windows in the rear elevation as shown on plan X shall be fitted with obscure glazing to a height of 1.7 metres and retained in perpetuity. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced details of the terrace balustrades and obscure glazing at a minimum of 1.45m shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development and the details shall be retained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority

20. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, **no additional windows**, no roof extensions, rear extensions, outbuildings, means of enclosure (walls/fences), shall be erected without the grant of planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Following a vote with 9 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 1 abstention, 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.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of the report)

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval
- 4) Construction management plan (CMP)
- 5) Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- 6) Green walls
- 7) Roof restrictions as balconies
- 8) Central Satellite dish
- 9) Hard and soft landscaping
- 10) Cycle Parking
- 11) Details of balustrades **including an amendment relating to obscure glazing**
- 12) Electric vehicle provision
- 13) Section 278 Agreement
- 14) Retention of parking spaces
- 15) Fit out of community use
- 16) Part M4(2) Accessible and adaptable dwellings
- 17) Land contamination
- 18) Site specific geotechnical investigations and method statement for construction of basement works
- 19) Qualified engineer to oversee construction of basement works
- 20) Removal of permitted development rights **including an amendment relating to obscure glazing**
- 21) Hours of use / community
- 22) Waste collection

9. HGY/2021/2283 AND 2284 - PRINTWORKS NOS. 819-829 HIGH ROAD, N17 8ER

The Committee considered an application for full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures to the rear of 819-829 High Road; the demolition of 829 High Road; and redevelopment for a residential-led, mixed-use development comprising residential units (C3), flexible commercial, business and service uses (Class E), a cinema (Sui Generis), hard and soft landscaping, parking, and associated works. To include the change of use of 819-827 High Road to flexible residential (C3), cinema (Sui Generis), and commercial, business and service uses (Class E).

The Committee also considered an application for listed building consent for Internal and external alterations to 819/821 High Road (Grade II), including reinstatement of hipped roof, demolition works to the rear, facade and related external works, internal alterations, and associated works.

Philip Elliott, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- In relation to health, some members of the Committee noted that the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) had requested a section 106 contribution for new healthcare provision. The Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability clarified that the council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was clear that health contributions were made through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rather than section 106 legal agreements. It was noted that the CIL payable was a fixed amount based on floorspace and could not be negotiated. It was explained that CIL money could be spent on health services in the borough and that the council and health partners had a wider relationship to discuss CIL spending. It was noted that CIL was decided by Cabinet but that the CIL governance policy document and delivery plan took health into consideration. It was added that the health services were regularly involved in infrastructure planning discussions.
- Ian Laurence (F3), applicant team, confirmed that affordable housing would be distributed evenly throughout the development, across all unit sizes and different locations throughout the buildings. Richard Serra (Tottenham Hotspur Football Club), applicant team, stated that the offer was policy compliant and the council would have the option to buy some of the units. It was noted that the council would likely not look to buy the intermediate units as it would not be cost effective to obtain the units at intermediate levels and offer them as council rents.
- It was clarified that there would be 200sqm of playspace on the podium level which would be accessible by all residents. It was noted that there would be an outdoor, communal amenity space which would be compliant with policy. It was added that the scheme would also improve the public realm in Brunswick Square and Percival Court, including a widened vehicle carriageway and delineated pedestrian area.
- The Planning Officer noted that the applicant had requested a five year permission and that this was considered to be acceptable to provide some time for future agreements with neighbouring land owners.
- It was explained that the scheme would provide 19.5% family housing and it was noted that this was a relatively high level compared to other private schemes, particularly in a dense site near a town centre.
- Some members of the Committee enquired why the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rate would apply when the permission was granted rather than when it was issued. The Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that this was a technical point. It was explained that planning permission was only issued when the section 106 agreement was agreed which, in this case, could result in an increase that would prejudice the affordable housing arrangements that had been negotiated and agreed. It was highlighted that this was a pragmatic solution and was only applicable for applications where there was a risk that the grant of permission would be finalised when a new CIL rate had come into effect.

- It was enquired why the Public Health comments expressed concerns about the number of flats per floor. The Head of Development Management explained that the London Plan guidance advised that there should not be more than eight flats per corridor in order to prevent the use of long, thin corridors with little light in a dense development. It was noted that, due to the square shape of the proposal, this was not a scenario of concern as envisioned in the London Plan.
- It was noted that the figures in relation to single aspect properties did not add up and clarification was sought. Ian Laurence (F3), applicant team, explained that 70% of the units would be dual aspect or greater and that 30% of the units would be single aspect. It was noted that there may be some misallocation in the report but the applicant team confirmed that there would only be one south facing, single aspect unit and that there would be no north facing, single aspect units.
- The Committee welcomed the fact that council tenants would be spread across estate but enquired whether clustering these homes would assist in minimising service charges to ensure that the units were affordable. The Head of Development Management explained that a number of the proposed council units would be located in the maisonettes on the street and would avoid some of the issues typically associated with service charges.
- Ian Laurence (F3), applicant team, explained that green roofs were part of the SUDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) strategy for the scheme. It was added that photovoltaic (PV) arrays would be located on roofs to provide on site energy generation and that these would be maximised on taller roofs.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below and a section 278 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 10/03/2022 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.
3. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for above, planning permission is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
4. To GRANT Listed Building Consent and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the Listed Building Consent and impose conditions and informatives.
5. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any

alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions (planning permission and/or Listed Building Consent) as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions Summary – Planning Application HGY/2021/2283 (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 01 of the report).

Informatives Summary – Planning Application HGY/2019/2283 (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 01 to the report).

Conditions Summary – Listed Building Consent Application HGY/2021/2284 (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 02 of the report).

Informatives Summary – Listed Building Consent HGT/2019/2284 (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 02 to the report).

Section 106 Heads of Terms: (full text is contained in the report).

6. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for, the planning application and Listed Building Consent applications be refused for the following reasons:

Planning Application

- i. In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable housing and 2) viability review mechanisms the proposals would fail to foster a mixed and balanced neighbourhood where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies GG1, H4, H5 and H6, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM11 and DM13, and Policy TH12.
- ii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing financial contributions towards infrastructure provision (community space, library, and publicly accessible open space realm), the scheme would fail to make a proportionate contribution towards the costs of providing the infrastructure needed to support the comprehensive development of Site Allocation NT5. As such, the proposals are contrary to London Plan Policy S1, Strategic Policies SP16 and SP17, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policies AAP1, AAP11 and NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM48.
- iii. In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) a residential Travel Plan and financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, 2) Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments to change car parking control measures, 3) and car club contributions the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T5, T1, T2, T3, T4 and T6. Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.

- iv. In the absence of an Employment and Skills Plan the proposals would fail to ensure that Haringey residents benefit from growth and regeneration. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy E11 and DM DPD Policy DM40.
- v. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of an energy strategy, including connection to a DEN, and carbon offset payments the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy SI 2 and Strategic Policy SP4, and DM DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.
- vi. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme and the borough's Construction Partnership, the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D14, Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

Listed Building Consent

- i. In the absence of a planning permission for the proposed change of use of the ground floor and conversion of the upper floors to housing, the proposed removal of historic fabric and internal and external alterations would be unnecessary and unacceptable. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies HC1, Strategic Policy SP12 and DM DPD Policy DM9.
7. In the event that the Planning Application and Listed Building Consent Applications are refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission and associated Listed Building Consent which duplicates the Planning Application and Listed Building Consent provided that:
- i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
 - ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
 - iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.
8. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to refuse 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.

At 9.05pm, the Committee agreed a short adjournment. The meeting resumed at 9.10pm.

10. HGY/2021/2882 - LAND ADJOINING REMINGTON ROAD AND PULFORD ROAD, N15

The Committee considered an application for the redevelopment of site including demolition of garages to provide 46 new homes for Council rent (Use Class C3) comprising part 3, 5 and 6 storey apartment buildings (31 homes) and 1, 2 and 3 storey houses and maisonettes (15 homes) with associated amenity space, landscaping, refuse/ recycling and cycle storage facilities. Reconfiguration of Remington Road as one-way street, 7 on-street parking spaces, children's play space, public realm improvements and relocation of existing refuse/recycling facilities.

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

- It was enquired why the proposal would be built on green space and how many trees would be removed. The Planning Officer explained that the site was not classified as green space but included an area of non-designated open space which was considered to be low quality. It was noted that 15 trees would be lost but that there would be 63 new trees. The Head of Development Management acknowledged that the quantitative loss of open space was not strictly in accordance with Policy DM20, which stated that there should be no net loss. However, as the area had been assessed as low quality space and the proposal would deliver enhancements, it was considered that the benefits outweighed the harm of the proposal and that the scheme was acceptable.
- Some members noted that there had been little response to the consultation and commented that it was reassuring to see some comments in the addendum. It was suggested that the council should employ a community development worker to coproduce the communal areas with residents. Martin Cowie, applicant team, explained that residents and the local community would be consulted on the specifics of the landscaping. It was noted that the current proposals were based on the comments received so far but that further engagement would take place. It was confirmed that, although it may not be possible to deliver some requests, the applicant would be happy to accept a condition to reflect this.
- In relation to a question about the response from the Conservation Officer, it was clarified that the site was located in the St Ann's Conservation Area, not the Wood Green Conservation Area. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer had not objected to the proposals and it was considered that there would be no harm to the conservation area.
- The Head of Development Management explained that, as this was a council application, the carbon offset payment would be undertaken as an exchange of letters between Council Directors as it was not possible for the council to secure a section 106 agreement with itself.

- Some members drew attention to the illustration of the village square and raised concerns that there was a pathway from the playspace directly onto the road. It was also noted that raised walls were considered to be unsafe as pedestrians could be pinned against these walls by cars. It was suggested that the square should be redesigned. Sarah (Landscape Architect), applicant team, noted that this area was currently a triangular area of grass with two benches and bins. It was explained that the proposed village square was not a formal playspace but would be used for doorstep play. It was added that there were raised planters to create a buffer and that there was separation between the pavement and road so that there was a clear distinction.
- It was enquired whether there could be a safety audit in relation to the village square. Satish Jassal (Architect), applicant team, noted that the proposals had been subject to a road safety audit and no concerns had been raised.

Jack Grant spoke in objection to the application. He commented that the applicants had described the playspace as informal but that the main justification for removing the park was that it was not a designated playspace. It was stated that there was analysis of the child yield calculations but that current residents were not counted within this. Jack Grant noted that the applicant's response in the addendum stated that 17 out of 38 respondents to the ballot had confirmed that they used the park but he commented that most people did not respond to planning issues as they did not believe they were listened to. It was stated that there were 670 units on the estate and that these residents required open space. It was noted that playspace would be lost and that most of the playspace and space would be shared with the wider community. Jack Grant expressed concerns that there were some units which would not meet lighting standards and that a number of these were disabled units. He added that, although most areas allowed an appropriate wheelchair passing width of 1.5m, the areas where this was not provided were between wheelchair units and the parking spaces for these units.

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

- Jack Grant confirmed that he did not live on the site but that he was a member of the Homes for Haringey residents' liaison committee.

Satish Jassal (Architect), Sarah (Landscape Architect), and Martin Cowie (Planning Advisor), applicant team, addressed the Committee. Satish Jassal noted that a section 105 consultation had taken place on the loss of open space. It was reported that letters had been sent to 671 households; 17 responses had been received from those who used the open space and four responses had been received from those who used the area daily. It was added that there had been no objections from the houses in the immediate area in relation to the detailed plans.

The applicant team provided a correction in relation to the comments made in relation to daylight and sunlight. It was noted that only one of the wheelchair homes would have a reduction in daylight and sunlight. It was explained that, as this unit would have an open plan living and kitchen area, this would be a deeper room but that it should be more accessible.

It was noted that there would be 900sqm of open space and playspace, which exceeded the requirement by 340sqm. It was explained that there would be additional space for existing children in the area although there was no requirement for the applicant to factor this in for existing homes.

In relation to arrangements for people who used wheelchairs, it was noted that regulations required a minimum of 1.5m for pavements, which allowed two wheelchairs to pass, and that this would be provided in all locations.

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

- In relation to a question about how many respondents did not use the open space, Satish Jassal noted that 671 letters had been sent out, approximately 38 responses had been received, 17 responses indicated occasional use of the space, and four responses indicated daily use of the space.
- It was confirmed that the applicant had tried to maximise the use of solar panels and that there would be 247 solar panels across the roofs. It was noted that the energy from these solar panels would go directly into the homes and would be supplemented with an air source heat pump. It was added that green roofs would also be incorporated for biodiversity and drainage purposes.

The Committee requested that the conditions should include a requirement for the applicant to coproduce with residents in relation to the open space and to undertake an assessment of safety. Martin Cowie, applicant team, asked that the safety assessment was specified as an assessment of play space safety rather than road safety; this was accepted by the Committee.

In relation to the Committee's request to include coproduction with residents and playspace safety, the Head of Development Management suggested that this could be incorporated into condition 18 as follows: No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, **including measurements to coproduce with local residents and to include an assessment of playspace safety**, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. This was agreed by the Committee.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions, 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 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, Building 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 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 10/02/2022 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director 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 the resolution above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of this report)

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval
- 4) Energy strategy
- 5) Overheating
- 6) Living roofs
- 7) Biodiversity
- 8) Land contamination
- 9) Unexpected land contamination
- 10) Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM)
- 11) Demolition management Plan (DMP)/ Construction Management Plan (CMP)
- 12) Drainage/ SuDS
- 13) Drainage/ SuDS – Maintenance
- 14) Telecommunications apparatus/ S Dishes
- 15) Secure by design
- 16) Cycle storage
- 17) Refuse storage
- 18) Hard and soft landscaping including tree replacement **as amended**
- 19) Electric vehicle charging points (EVCP)
- 20) Obscure glazing
- 21) Servicing and Delivery Plan

Informatives

- 1) CIL liable
- 2) Hours of construction
- 3) Asbestos removal
- 4) Street Numbering
- 5) Thames Water
- 6) Thames Water 2
- 7) Fire safety and sprinklers
- 8) Network Rail
- 9) Secure by design

Planning Obligations

5. Planning obligations are usually secured through a S106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the local planning authority and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.

6. Several obligations which would ordinarily be secured through a S106 legal agreement will instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.
7. It is recognised that the Council cannot commence enforcement against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's housing service and the planning service, including the resolution of non-compliances with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.
8. The Council cannot impose conditions on planning permissions requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Housing, Regeneration and Planning has confirmed in writing that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented.

Head of Terms:

1. Carbon offset contribution
 - Initial and deferred payment of £31,722.90 (50% of expected carbon offset based on the energy report) + any uplift. Payable on implementation including a 10% management fee.
2. Amending TMO
 - The applicant must contribute a sum of £4,000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.
3. Employment skills provision
 - Provision of employment skills and support payment
4. Social Rent
5. Car Club membership
6. Residential Travel Plan
7. Employment and skills plan
8. Considerate Contractors
9. Carbon offset financial contribution (see below)
10. Architect retention

11. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

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.

12. 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.

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 31 January 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank