

Planning Sub Committee 7<sup>th</sup> March 2022

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEMS

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 10

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2022/0035	<b>Ward:</b> Tottenham Green
<b>Address:</b> Land at Watts Close, London N15 5DW	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of 11 dwellings and community building and replace with 18 new homes for council rent. Erect 6 no. two-storey family houses (three and four bedrooms) and 12 apartments (one and two bedrooms) in 2 three-storey blocks including 2 wheelchair user dwellings. The proposals includes 2. on-site wheelchair parking bays, amenity and play space, landscaping, cycle and refuse/recycling storage.	
<b>Applicant:</b> Haringey Council	
<b>Ownership:</b> Council	

**Main report- correction:**

6.6.21 Wheelchair housing represent 40% 11% of all new units provided. This is compliant with policies.

**Shadow obligations amendment-**

*9. S278 Highways work*

Replaced with

*Works to existing highways*

(A S278 agreement is not applicable as the Council is the applicant).

**APPENDIX 1 (Conditions)**

**Replace condition 3 to include more detailed requirements-**

*Detailed design/ materials*

*Prior to the commencement of buildings works above grade, detailed drawings, including sections, to a scale of 1:20 to confirm the detailed design and materials of the:*

- a) Detailed elevational treatment;*
- b) Detailing of roof and parapet treatment;*
- c) Details of windows, which shall include a recess of at least 115mm;*
- d) Details of entrances, which shall include a recess of at least 115mm;*
- e) Details and locations of rain water pipes; and*

*f) Details of balustrade*

*Shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted.*

*Samples of brickworks, windows, roof, glazing, balustrade, should also be provided. A schedule of the exact product references for other materials. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details.*

*Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with Policies DM1, DM8 and DM9 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017*

**Additional Representation**

A Petition has been received and is attached and Appendix 3. The new points raised are addressed as follows:

**Point 12 CGIs**

Response:

There is no intention to remove the wall in question. The wall in question does not form part of the site. It is shown as removed for presentation purposes only. CGIs are indicative and not the approved drawing.

**Point 16.**

Response:

The applicant has advised that large amounts of Asbestos were discovered within the community hall which was considered safer to remove as soon as possible.

All other points have been addressed in the report

## **APPENDIX 3:**

### **REPRESENTATIONS BY Adjoining occupiers/ neighbours – Addition (received**

#### **PETITION**

regarding the proposed development on Watts Close

Ref: HGY/2022/0035

#### **We oppose the proposed development for the following reasons:**

1. No parking bays are provided for in the proposed development, and 7 existing parking bays will be lost in Watts Close to make way for the development.
2. Many of the new residents will need vehicles for their trade and other reasons, and will end up parking in Greenfield Road, Seaford Road, Roslyn Road and Lomond Close overnight (when there are no restrictions) and during daytime, causing additional pressures on the existing scarcity of parking spaces on these roads (even if the Council will not provide parking permits to the new residents).
3. A comment was made at one online meeting that even if some residents may not need a vehicle now, their needs can change over time. The response of the Council is “Noted and thank you”. (*Statement of Community Involvement p32*). No consideration has been given to making the development future-proof.
4. At the ‘community engagement’ stage, the Council stated that a Parking survey would be conducted but the report is not amongst the documents enclosed with the planning application although 18/29 respondents to the survey stated that parking is an important issue.
5. Access to Veolia’s collection vehicles, Amazon vans, Hermes vans, supermarket vans, furniture delivery vans, ambulances etc will be limited, causing these vehicles to stop on, and obstruct, the adjacent road and the free flow of traffic.
6. The proposed development, comprising of an imposing bricked one-building with 90° angles, is out of character with the neighbouring properties that comprise of council houses with white cladding and 1910’s terraced houses. The proposed development can only be described as a concrete jungle and will be just an ugly eyesore in the locality.
7. 26/29 responses stated that the height of the development is an important issue. Yet the Council has not made any revision to the height of the development.
8. Many residents have commented that reduction in light to neighbouring properties is an important issue but the Council has chosen to ignore this. Even the experts commissioned by the Council could only make a statement “in our opinion” and not a statement of fact despite extensive tests carried out. This means other experts could give a contrary opinion.
9. Loss of privacy, with residents in the proposed development being able to see through windows of neighbouring properties and look into the gardens of

neighbouring properties has also attracted comments, and once again the Council has chosen to ignore this important concern.

10. There are concerns about criminality, drug dealing and drug abuse that the proposed development will attract. At an online meeting, the person answering questions had to be helped about what PSPO is. This may explain why issues of ASB, burglary, drug dealing etc in the area are not known to the developers.
11. The lockable railings between No 44 and No 45 Lomond Close had been put in place to stop burglars gaining access to the back doors and back windows of houses, and only one person was given custody of the keys to enable access to Lomond Hall. Now that Lomond Hall has been demolished, there will be “appropriate fencing and boundary treatment” which is rather vague. In the absence of Lomond Hall, a wall needs to be in place of the lockable railings to ensure there will be no possibility of access whatsoever.
12. In the picture ‘View of two proposed houses in Lomond Close’, the wall at the boundary of the car port of No 45 Lomond Close has been edited out, which is a clear deception. It shows the alleyway between No 44 and No 45 as an open space, which is not the case.
13. The demolition of Lomond Hall has been accompanied by a lot of noise and dust. This will no doubt intensify with the building work for the new development, with dust building up on houses, structural cracks arising from impact and ground movement, etc. It is necessary that a compensation scheme is established before any work takes place.
14. Demolition of Lomond Hall was starting at 7.00 am. We need confirmation that building work will not take place during the early morning hours, in the evenings and on weekends as the impact noises would echo through the rows of terraced houses surrounding the entire construction area.
15. It is also necessary for a clear regeneration plan to be in place for the surrounding roads, including road repairs, new kerbs and paving, new trees, and modernisation of infrastructure such as EV charge points on lamp posts to be in place before any planning application for a development on Watts Close is approved.
16. **The letter notifying residents of the planning application** was dated 13 January 2022 but residents received it on 27 January i.e. we received it two weeks later. The letter asked for comments by 11 February 2022, **giving only 2 weeks** to read about 60 documents, some of which are over 30 pages long. The notification is therefore null and void.
17. **Most residents in the neighbourhood do not have online facilities and have been disenfranchised in the consultation process.** Those residents have not been able to access the documentation on the website. Thus, only those who have online facilities could submit comments on the planning application. Furthermore, only those who have submitted comments have been informed of the meeting of the Planning Sub-Committee of 7 March, which disenfranchises those without online facilities further.

18. Furthermore, the Notice of receipt of Planning Application was dated 22 January but affixed on a lamp post on 29 January (i.e. **one week later**). The Council then proceeded to start demolition of Lomond Hall on 15 February without planning permission.
19. In addition, **the Council served Notice of suspension of 4 parking bays in Lomond Close** for 10 months for demolition works **from 28 February**. However, the demolition works **started on 15 February**, and some contractor vehicles received parking tickets. **The Council then affixed a Notice of suspension of parking pre-dating it as taking effect from 21 February!**
20. Moreover, contractors have also been parking outside the specified bays as well as on residents' car ports. A clear and thoroughly worked out plan specifying the spaces contractor vehicles will use need to be in place before commencement of further work and should be submitted with a new planning application to avoid inconveniences to local residents.
21. It is unreasonable to assume that wheelchair users will only need one-bedroom flats. Some families have one adult or child who is a wheelchair user, and the wheelchair parking / EV bays could be far from where a wheelchair user lives. For this reason, the wheelchair parking / EV bays should be located in the middle of the development, not at the far end.
22. Large trees would be cut down and replaced by smaller trees.
23. A claim has been made that nearly 100% of the roof space will be covered by solar panels. Yet the drawings show the roofs covered with grass !
24. There has been no thinking about other green sources of energy, such as heat pumps, in order to make the development net zero.
25. The planning application form states the cost of the development to be between £2million and £100 million, an incredibly wide range. Clearly no costing has been made. This prevents both the residents as well as the Planning Sub-Committee from assessing if the project is likely to provide Value for Money. Residents are being kept in the dark about the expected cost, although it's the residents who pay for the cost through Council Taxes. Questions from residents at an online meeting about the projected cost of the development and the cost of surveys, architecture etc have remained unanswered (*see Statement of Community Involvement, p19*). This shows a clear lack of accountability. Future maintenance costs have not been estimated. Net Present Value calculations, common for long-term projects, have not been provided.
26. In the pre-application 'community engagement' document, it was stated that this consultation was not legally required. No mention was made that community engagement was expected by the Planning Committee, showing that the promoters lacked commitment to community engagement.
27. 66% of respondents found the pre-planning application community engagement to be 'very negative or 'somewhat negative'.
28. **The dismissive responses to the 'community engagement' are very curt and unsettling.** The planning application should be dismissed and the Council

needs to go back to the drawing board and address community concerns seriously.

[Followed by 105 names / addresses]