

MINUTES OF PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 2022, 7.00 - 8.40 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Peter Mitchell, and Councillor Liz Morris, Councillor Reg Rice, and Councillor Viv Ross.

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 Councillors Sheila Peacock, Gina Adamou, Emine Ibrahim, and Yvonne Say.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. MINUTES

Cllr Mitchell drew attention to item 8, HGY/2021/2031 - Wood Green Social Club, 3 & 4 Stuart Crescent, N22 5NJ, on page 3 of the agenda pack. The minutes stated 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'. It was noted that this should state that 'the Construction Management Plan did **not** mention any protection for gardens and boundaries during demolition and construction or any responsibility for repairs necessary as a result'. This was agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED

That, subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 10 January 2022 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

7. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

8. PPA-2021-0010 - CAR PARK AND OPEN LAND TO THE REAR OF KERSWELL CLOSE AND 162 ST ANN'S ROAD, LONDON, N15 5HT

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of existing retail unit and removal of existing car park and erection of a part 4, part 5 storey building plus a separate dwelling house comprising 26 new affordable homes for Council rent together with associated amenity space, two car parking spaces, secure cycle and refuse storage, landscaping, tree planting and other public realm works.

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

- It was clarified that the applicant team was no longer proposing to locate a house in the centre of the courtyard as, following discussions with the Planning Team, it was considered better to have an area of open space. It was explained that a four bed wheelchair unit was now proposed instead of a house.
- Some members queried the accuracy of the diagrams provided in the report. The Planning Officer explained that the proposals were being developed and that there had been some changes since the diagram was circulated. It was noted that the only key difference was the introduction of a four bed wheelchair unit in place of the previously proposed house.
- It was noted that a previous application for this site had been submitted by a different applicant and the current application had been submitted by the Council. The Planning Officer clarified that there was no relationship between the previous applicant and the Council.
- The Committee enquired about the layout of the proposals and whether it would be possible to deliver additional units by amending the use of the space near Kerswell Close. The applicant team explained that this had been considered with the Quality Review Panel (QRP) and Planning Officers and that some useful feedback had been received. It was considered that any building on the northern frontage would negatively impact both the garden area and the service road. It was added that the current proposal felt more connected to the surroundings and that there would be an opportunity to enhance the area, including through co-production with residents.
- In response to a query about the location of the site in a critical drainage area, the applicant team noted that there would be drainage, including sustainable drainage.
- It was enquired whether the screening from trees would be effective during the winter. The applicant team noted that there would be some screening from trees in winter but that this was likely to be reduced. It was added that root preservation and the presence of birds on site would also need to be addressed.
- The applicant team explained that all but one of the flats would be dual aspect and that daylight and sunlight consultants were looking at each flat.

- It was clarified that family units would only be located on the ground and first floors. The taller blocks would have a lift and the four storey block would have stairs.
- The Committee expressed some concerns that the lighter brickwork proposed for some areas of the building would be damaged by pollution and would have a negative visual impact, particularly if the façade was rendered. The applicant team clarified that the façade would be made of brick rather than rendered and that textured and flecked bricks, which would weather well, were being considered. It was added that there was a reasonable precedent for lighter bases in London so this would not be automatically discounted as an option.
- Some members highlighted the concerns expressed by the QRP about the height of the buildings and that the buildings should have lifts to accommodate the large family units. The applicant team explained that the mix of units had changed as the scheme design had evolved. The height of the scheme had been reduced and it was currently proposed to have 25 flats, with 4 family units, 12 two bed units, and 9 one bed units.
- It was clarified that the QRP was a group of professional design experts and did not include councillors.
- In relation to trees on the site, the applicant team explained that it was aimed to retain the largest and best quality trees and to re-provide trees that were lost. It was added that the proposals would involve re-providing trees in more barren areas.
- It was noted that the houses in the immediate vicinity would have access to, and would be included in co-producing, the open spaces.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

9. PPA-2021-0017 - 313-315 THE ROUNDWAY AND 8-10 CHURCH LANE, LONDON, N17 7AB

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new retail and workspace at ground floor and 76 dwellings plus new landscaping, car and cycle parking.

Christopher Smith, Planning Officer, highlighted that there had been an error in the report and it was clarified that the scheme was not an entirely rented development and would be available for sale with a proportion of the affordable housing being made available to rent.

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

- It was noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had expressed some concerns about long corridors and rooms with low light levels. The applicant team explained that the internal layout and sequencing was still being developed and was being considered alongside environmental testing for noise, air quality, and ventilation. It was added that the longer corridors had light and ventilation and it was not considered that the corridors were excessively long.
- The Committee noted that the QRP had considered that there were too many single aspect flats and it was enquired whether the applicant would be making any adjustments. The applicant team noted that this element of the scheme had been

improved and it was now proposed to have 74% of units with dual aspect. Where a unit was single aspect, it tended to be south facing with good access to light.

- It was noted that there was a busy junction between the railway and Lordship Lane located near the site and it was enquired how traffic and other noise could be mitigated. The applicant team explained that air quality and noise had been tested and there was confidence that they could provide a high level of residential amenity. It was added that there would be different approaches to the balconies on each side of the proposal to mitigate issues.
- The QRP had commented that the top floor of the proposals did not look as well protected from the sun. The applicant team noted that there had been some amendments to the design following QRP comments and that the corner of the proposal would now be set back, wrapped around, and more interesting.
- In response to questions about the layout of the buildings and the site, the applicant team stated that the site was complicated and that, with advice, they had tried to bring forward a coherent scheme. It was noted that some previous attempts to develop the site had been unsuccessful as there had been insufficient land but that additional land had now been secured. It was explained that the proposals would have a route through the site and views to Bruce Castle. The applicant team noted that buildings would be set back in order to minimise the impact on Bruce Castle. There would be playspace, a garden, and areas where residents could have allotments. There would also be greening of the frontage and all roofs would have water storage. The applicant team also noted that it had been highlighted from the outset of the project that it would likely not be possible to meet affordable housing targets on the site due to the heritage setting. It was explained that this was a modest scheme and that, although costs could be reduced to provide additional affordable housing, the applicant did not want to compromise on the quality of the scheme.
- In relation to noise issues, it was noted that there was a small area of private amenity for the family sized units in Block D. It was explained that this space would provide a buffer between the units and the adjoining garage and car wash area. It was envisioned that the garage may be used less over time, as more sustainable modes of transport were developed, and that there could be scope to include the area within the site. It was added that the scheme had been re-orientated so that it faced towards Bruce Castle.
- It was noted that there had been some discussions about removing the gate to the site. It was explained that this would provide some additional amenity and would allow free movement across the site but that some safety concerns, particularly concerns about overnight access, were being considered.
- It was clarified that the applicant had designed the scheme so that the business operations of the petrol station were not impeded but so that it would be possible for the site to be further developed if the opportunity arose. The applicant team also noted that the substation adjacent to the site was considered to have some architectural merit but that it would be beneficial to improve the boundary treatment; the applicant would be willing to contribute to this.
- In relation to schools, the applicant team stated that there had been and would be child yield assessments but there was no indication that the development would have a significant impact on the capacity of local schools. It was added that the applicant would pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions.
- In response to queries about the availability and accessibility of cycle storage, the applicant team explained that they were trying to encourage the use of bicycles.

They were considering the practicalities of cycle storage, including the access routes for cycle storage, the availability of two smaller stores rather than one large store, and the availability of single stacking for those who could not reach taller storage options. It was confirmed that the proposal was due to have 140 cycle spaces for the 76 flats.

- The Committee commented that the overhanging balconies could create a dark passageway and it was enquired how this would be made safe by design. The applicant team stated that the passageway was quite short and that, due to the orientation, the area would receive a lot of light during the day and would be well lit at night. It was added that the QRP felt that the scale of the proposal was impressive.
- The Committee asked how Church Lane would reflect the heritage of Bruce Castle Park. The applicant team explained that they had originally wanted to use brick to reflect Bruce Castle but that they felt it was important not to have a pastiche or detract from Bruce Castle itself. Instead, the applicant was seeking to reflect Bruce Castle more subtly through dark brick and red lintels, windows, cornices, and the progressively set back pavilions.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

In response to a question about HGY/2021/2151 – 109 Fortis Green, it was noted that this was expected to be presented to the Committee in March 2022. It was also confirmed that the application for Banqueting Suite, 819-821 High Road (Printworks) had been agreed by the Committee in January 2022.

In relation to pre-applications, it was anticipated that Highgate School would be presented to the Committee in the summer of 2022. It was noted that the issue was currently being considered by the Quality Review Panel (QRP). As this was a major application, it was also expected that the applicant would be undertaking their own engagement, in addition to the statutory requirements.

Some members expressed concerns that the legal agreement for application HGY/2020/0847 – Lockkeepers Cottage, Ferry Lane had not yet been signed. The Head of Development Management explained that there had been some delays in transferring the land which were out of the council's control. It was noted that officers would continue to liaise with the applicant.

In relation to HGY/2021/2727 – Cranwood House, Muswell Hill, Road/Woodside Ave, N10, it was noted that the applicant team was considering the position of the application.

It was noted that there were two major pre-applications with similar addresses on Tottenham Lane. The Head of Development Management explained that both pre-applications concerned the same site but that there were two pre-applications which related to a previous and current owner of the site.

The Chair noted that any further queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

11. 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.

12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 7 March 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date