

# **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 7TH MARCH, 2022, 7.00 - 10.05 PM**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Barbara Blake, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Liz Morris, Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross (from item 7), and Councillor Yvonne Say.

**In attendance:** Councillor Pippa Connor, Muswell Hill ward, and 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 Sheila Peacock, Councillor Gina Adamou, and Councillor Emine Ibrahim. Councillor Barbara Blake was in attendance as substitute.

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Viv Ross.

## **4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **6. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

That the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 7 February 2022 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/2021/3522 - RAMSEY COURT, PARK ROAD, LONDON, N8 8JU**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of garages and removal of parking area and erection of 3no. x 2-storey houses fronting Barrington Road with front and rear gardens and associated cycle and refuse/recycling storage. Erection of 6 apartments in a 3-storey building fronting onto Park Road and associated external amenity space, cycle and refuse/recycling storage. Landscaping improvements around Ramsey Court including new communal garden, planting, trees and boundary hedging, and provision of new refuse/recycling store and cycle storage facilities for existing residents. 2no. on-street wheelchair parking spaces and new street trees along Park Road.

Conor Guilfoyle, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- In response to a question about Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), the Transport Planning Team Manager explained that the parking stress had been calculated within a radius of 200 metres. It was noted that the worst case scenario for parking stress was 101% but this assumed that all garages were used for parking and this was known not to be the case. It was stated that the realistic parking stress was estimated to be approximately 92%; although this was above the 85% threshold for parking difficulty, it was concluded that the parking stress survey was robust and it was supported from a transport planning perspective.
- In relation to daylight impact, the Planning Officer noted that the BRE (Building Research Establishment) Guide was not an absolute indicator of acceptability. It was explained that it was intended to be used more flexibly and pragmatically in an urban context. It was added that daylight in certain rooms, such as living rooms, was considered to be more important than other rooms, such as bedrooms. On balance, it was considered that the proposal was compliant.
- Some members commented that the site was classified as Flood Risk Zone 1 but that it had flooded twice last summer; it was asked what mitigations were in place. The Planning Officer explained that the flood rating was set by the Environment Agency but that the scheme included a mandatory sustainable drainage requirement.
- It was acknowledged that Block B had a noise limit for air source heat pumps but it was queried whether Block A needed similar measures. The Planning Officer believed that there was also plant on the roof of Block A but it was explained that Block B was a lower building and there was a higher risk of noise traveling to residential units.
- It was confirmed that there would be a net loss of open space. It was commented that Policy DM20 recognised the importance of the quality of space, rather than just the quantity, and that the scheme aimed to provide a higher quality of space.
- Some members commented that some distances between buildings seemed tight and it was queried whether there was a requirement to have a 20 metre gap. The Planning Officer explained that the 20 metre guidance was typically for more

suburban areas. It was acknowledged that this was not always possible on constrained sites but it was stated that the layout of the scheme was designed to have a lower impact.

- It was queried whether the site was within 5 metres of a strategic water main. It was clarified that this was not the case and that Thames Water had initially thought that this site was in a different location.
- Some members queried the suggestion in the report that there would be a 101% reduction in carbon as the site was currently a grass area. The Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning explained that, in this case, there was no carbon offset requirement. All carbon targets would be met on site and so there was no requirement for a financial payment offsite. It was clarified that there would be a reduction against the threshold target.
- In relation to the replacement trees, it was enquired how long it would take for the same level of canopy coverage to be achieved on Park Road. The Tree and Nature Conservation Manager noted that there would be a net increase in tree cover. On Park Road, it was recommended that the existing Norway Maple trees and small apple tree were replaced with five London Plane trees. It was clarified that it would take approximately 15-20 years to achieve the same level of canopy cover but it was noted that the current trees had a limited life expectancy.

*At this point, Cllr Ross joined the meeting.*

Lea Govender spoke in objection to the application and explained that she was speaking on behalf of residents who were strongly against the proposals. It was noted that nearly 1700 people had signed a petition opposing the scheme and that there was no local support for development. In terms of grounds for rejection, it was stated that there would be a 40% loss of amenity green space and a 38% increase in units. It was considered that the proposals had excessive density and that the worth of green space had been underestimated. Lea Govender stated that the noise from the heat pumps was significant and would have a detrimental impact on mental health, particularly as more people were now working from home. It was felt that the environmental enhancements proposed would not provide adequate compensation for the loss of space. It was stated that the proposal would conflict with planning policy and would negatively impact residents and their wellbeing.

Joe Banks spoke in objection to the application and stated that the key reasons for the objection were set out in the written document that had been submitted. He explained that the main issue was whether the green site should be built on. It was stated that the space was a much loved feature and amenity in the community for the last 70 years and was beneficial for wellbeing as well as providing a carbon sink and flood runoff. It was noted that preserving green space and tree cover was essential for climate change and was a key priority for the Council. Joe Banks commented that a survey in July 2020 had played a key role in encouraging development on the site and he believed that the advice in survey was wrong. It was explained that the Norway Maples were said to be Category B and C trees that were of lower quality with a lower life expectancy but that this had been re-assessed by an expert who thought that at least two of these trees were Category A trees. It was stated that local authorities should do everything possible to retain Category A trees. It was considered that the replanting would be inadequate, that the loss of trees and green space would be

irreversible, and that this was an unsuitable location to build. The Committee was asked not to grant the application.

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

- The Committee asked whether the proposals had been co-designed with residents. Lea Govender noted that there had been a meeting but that the proposals were located so close to the building that co-designing was not possible. It was stated that the second phase of consultation had been undertaken through letters because of Covid-19. It was acknowledged that the plans had changed for building on the green space and the land at the back but that the development was still considered to be too close to existing buildings.
- In relation to the existing space, Lea Govender noted that the Council maintained the area but that residents also looked after the space and had planted hedges and picked up litter. She added that the area was important for residents as it provided an alternative to the nearby road, which was noisy and polluted. It was stated that, if the area had buildings, there would be reduced space and additional noise.

Cllr Pippa Connor, Muswell Hill ward, spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the social rent elements were welcomed but that the material considerations were density, loss of green space, removal of mature trees, poor air quality, design of the flats, and daylight and sunlight levels. She noted that Policy DM 23 stated that all proposals should consider air quality and that the air quality assessment for this application showed high levels of pollution. It was commented that the application proposed to remove mature trees and build on green space and that this was not considered to meet Policies G1 or DM23. Cllr Pippa Connor noted that London Policy D3 stated that scheme should enhance the local context but did not consider that the proposed block, brick building enhanced the area. She stated that there would be a lack of daylight in some flats and that some bedrooms would have no direct sunlight for a significant part of the working day; it was added that this was considered to be more important as more people worked from home. Cllr Pippa Connor asked the Committee to address the material considerations and to reject the application.

Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making, and Development, spoke in support of the application and stated that it was part of an ambitious council housing programme. It would provide three 3 bed family homes at affordable council rents. Cllr Ruth Gordon acknowledged that there had been a number of objections and that the plans had been adapted in response to comments over the last 18 months. She stated that there was a need for council housing in the west of the borough, as well as the east, particularly for family sized accommodation. She added that the scheme would increase biodiversity, would have net zero carbon, and would be economical to heat. Cllr Ruth Gordon asked the Committee to approve the application.

In response to the points raised by councillors, the following responses were provided:

- In response to a question about the development of the application, Cllr Ruth Gordon stated that there had been online and face to face consultation with residents. Martin Cowie, Haringey Planning Advisor, stated that there had been ongoing engagement with residents. There had been an initial community

engagement exercise based on a different scheme and that, following some concerns about the proposal to build some homes on the existing hardstanding, other options had been investigated. The scheme was amended and relocated from the Barrington Road side to the Park Road side and this change had been subject to wider engagement. It was noted that the team had carefully managed the block to ensure that the minimum number of trees was affected. In addition, there was a focus on enhancing environmental quality and replacing trees where possible. It was considered that the current scheme struck a balance between delivering affordable homes and ensuring mitigation against environmental harm and detriment to neighbouring amenity.

Samantha Jones, Haringey Housing Project Manager; Kiran Curtis, Architect; Frances Christie, Landscape architect; and Martin Cowie, Haringey Planning Advisor; addressed the Committee. Kiran Curtis, Architect, stated that there had been a number of consultation events in relation to the application. It was noted that, in response to comments from the consultation, the location of the block had been altered to the Park Road side. It was acknowledged that the scheme would involve building on green space and the removal of some trees but it was highlighted that there would also be a new garden; this garden would be over 420sqm and would be located in a better and more accessible space than the existing garden which was next to the road. Kiran Curtis noted that some of the proposed bedrooms in Block A did not meet the BRE recommendations in relation to sky sight but explained that all rooms passed the criteria for average daylight factor. In relation to design, he commented that significant work had been undertaken to echo the features of Barrington Road and Park Road, including building lines, plot widths, window proportions and rhythms, and building materials.

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

- In relation to resident engagement, the applicant team explained that the proposal had been refined incrementally after consultations with the community rather than being presented as a choice between two options. The team had aimed to enhance the environmental quality of the estate, to mitigate loss of sunlight and privacy, and had worked with the Local Planning Authority to ensure compliance.
- In response to comments about the design of the proposal, it was explained that the project team had aimed to optimise the land available to deliver predominantly social housing and so had reduced the size of the block on Park Road. The block was designed to be a contemporary building with traditional materials and a high quality appearance which reflected the varied appearance of Park Road.
- In relation to the proportion of social housing, the applicant team explained that it was sometimes possible to fund entirely social rent homes but that it was sometimes necessary to fund social housing through private units in order to deliver genuinely affordable homes.

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

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of an agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

**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. Details of hard and soft landscaping
5. SuDS Maintenance and Management
6. Energy Strategy
7. Overheating measures
8. Living roofs
9. Land contamination
10. Unexpected contamination
11. Non-Road Mobile Machinery
12. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
13. Construction and Energy Plan
14. Noise limits from plant
15. Cycle Parking
16. Construction Management Plan
17. Roof restrictions as balconies
18. Central Satellite dish
19. Satellite dish restriction
20. Highway works
21. Part M4(2)
22. Part M4(3)
23. Permitted development restrictions
24. Architect Retention

### **Informatives**

1. Co-operation
2. CIL liable
3. Hours of construction
4. Party Wall Act
5. Street Numbering
6. Fire safety and sprinklers
7. Surface water drainage
8. Thames Water
9. Asbestos
10. Secured by Design advice.

*Cllr Ross did not take part in the voting for this item as he was not present for the full item.*

## **9. HGY/2021/2151 - 109 FORTIS GREEN, LONDON, N2 9HR**

The Committee considered a full planning application for the demolition of all existing structures and redevelopment of the site to provide 10 residential units (use class C3) comprising of 6 residential flats and 4 mews houses and 131m2 flexible commercial space (Class E (a) - retail, E (b)-café/restaurant E(g)-office) in ground/lower ground floor unit, basement car parking and other associated works.

Valerie Okeiyi, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- Some members expressed concern about off-site provision for affordable housing and suggested that council housing should be supported in Fortis Green. The Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that section 106 funding was spent across the borough and that the funding for off-site provision would be used towards affordable housing, including in the west of the borough.
- The Planning Officer clarified that the current application had not been reviewed by the Quality Review Panel (QRP) because it was materially the same as the previous application. The Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning noted that the previous permission had been granted under largely similar planning policies and that this could be given a reasonable level of weight in decision making.
- It was confirmed that the report used census data from 2011 as this was the last, full set of information available. It was added that the data from the 2021 census was not fully published.
- In relation to a query about councillor comments, the Planning Officer noted that these had raised issues about underground parking, the height of the development, daylight, sunlight, privacy, and dust from construction.
- It was noted that it was helpful to include councillor comments and viability reports alongside the reports for ease of reference. It was confirmed that these could be included in future agenda packs.
- It was confirmed that waste would be collected from Fortis Green Road and that there was a management arrangement to bring bins within the recommended distance on collection day.
- In relation to distance, it was confirmed that the mews houses had habitable rooms facing onto the courtyard and bedrooms on the other side. It was added that there were a number of windows that had obscured glazing or thoughtful design. The distance across the courtyard was 11.2 metres and 12.9 metres.
- It was noted that the QRP had commented on the narrow entrances and it was enquired whether the width could be confirmed. It was commented that the passage was approximately 2 metres and that the plans were included in the report.
- Some members noted that there were two Victorian or Edwardian cobble crossings and it was enquired whether these stones could be retained in the vehicle crossover. It was suggested that, if the application was granted, this could be

included as an Informative in relation to Head of Term 3, Section 278 Highway Agreement.

Chris Halton spoke in objection to the application and explained that he had been a local resident for 17 years. He stated that he had been impressed by the original design specification and would welcome a residential development on the site but not in the form of this proposal. He explained that concerns had been raised by local residents and councillors relating to the proposed density, the proximity of houses to Annington Road, and the extensive excavation. It was considered that the proposal would result in an overdeveloped site that was not sensitive to its surroundings, particularly the lower level streetscapes to the north, south, and west.

Chris Halton stated that four of the proposed houses were close to Annington Road and that, although these were said to be 18 metres away, this would be closer to 30 feet. It was considered that the development would feel overbearing, would be a risk to privacy, and would almost eliminate the current views of the sky in surrounding houses. It was noted that the new homes would have gardens but that these would be small in size and, as they would be two storeys below the neighbouring garden walls, it was suggested that they would feel cramped. It was also stated that, since the 2017 application, there was now a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the area and it was felt that there was no longer a need for a large underground car park with significant excavation and carbon footprint.

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

- In relation to density, it was noted that the previous application was consistent with the London Plan at the time which used a density matrix. It was explained that the latest London Plan removed the density matrix and now had a design led approach.
- Geoff Wain and Mark Powell, applicant team, confirmed that the current application sought permission for the same number of units, density, and facilities as the previous application.

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

- Mark Powell, Architect, clarified that the works for the underground car park were anticipated to take between 48-52 weeks but that this would be subject to the results of detailed site analysis.

In response to a question about affordable housing, the Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning suggested that it would be possible to amend Head of Term 1 to prioritise off-site provision in Fortis Green ward, then surrounding wards, then other wards, before other locations were used. This was agreed by the Committee.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison moved to defer consideration of the application until figures were provided on affordable housing and a full viability statement was available to allow the Committee to make a fully informed decision. It was also suggested that, as the application was in a conservation area, the QRP should review the proposal; this was seconded by Cllr Ross. The Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning explained that the Council's third party, independent assessor had reviewed



the proposal and determined that it provided the maximum, reasonable amount of affordable housing. It was noted that officers were satisfied that the information required had been provided and added that the report could be published if helpful. There were 2 votes in favour of the motion to defer, 6 votes against the motion to defer, and 1 abstention. The motion was not passed.

It was noted that the proposal, as amended, was to grant the application subject to an amended Head of Term 1 (to prioritise off-site affordable housing provision in Fortis Green ward, then surrounding wards, then other wards, before other locations were used) and an Informative in relation the Head of Term 3 (to retain the existing cobble stones in the vehicle crossover as much as possible).

Following a vote with 7 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 2 abstentions, it was

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee resolve 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 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 section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 04/04/2022 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning Building Standards and Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

## **Conditions**

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Materials
4. Boundary treatment and access control
5. Landscaping
6. Lighting
7. Site levels
8. Secure by design
9. Secure by design (Commercial aspect)
10. Land Contamination
11. Unexpected Contamination

12. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
13. Energy strategy
14. Overheating
15. BREEAM (or equivalent)
16. Living walls/roof
17. Biodiversity
18. Construction Management Plan (Basement development)
19. Basement design
20. Cycle Parking details
21. Electric charging points
22. Satellite antenna
23. Kitchen Extract
24. Restriction to use class
25. Building Regs Part M
26. Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
27. Hours of use
28. Fire safety design

#### **Informatives**

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Water pressure
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Asbestos
- 8) Secure by design
- 9) Land contamination
- 10) Waste on site
- 11) Waste to be taken off site
- 12) Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water
- 13) Water pressure

#### **Section 106 Heads of Terms:**

1. Affordable Housing Provision
  - Financial contribution of £277,343 towards the provision of affordable housing off-site (with prioritisation of off-site affordable housing provision in Fortis Green ward, then surrounding wards, then other wards, before other locations were used).
2. Financial Viability Reviews
  - Early stage review if works do not commence within two years
  - Late Stage Review on completion of 80% (8) units
3. Section 278 Highway Agreement

- Reconstruction of the vehicular crossover and adjacent footways (with an Informative to retain the existing cobble stones in the vehicle crossover as much as possible).

#### 4 Sustainable Transport Initiatives

- £8,000 towards enhancement of parking control
- Monitoring per travel plan contribution of £3,000
- Three year free car club membership for all residents and £50 in credit per year for the first two years

#### 4. Carbon Mitigation

- Post-occupation Energy Statement review
- Contribution for carbon offsetting min. £16,647, to be confirmed by Energy Statement review
- 'Be Seen' commitment to uploading energy data

#### 5. Employment Initiative – participation and financial contribution towards Local Training and Employment Plan

- Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator;
- Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies;
- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents;
- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees;
- Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff);
- Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs.

#### 6. Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value of contributions (not including monitoring);
- £500 per non-financial contribution;
- Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000

1. In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.
2. That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
  1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of off-site affordable housing the scheme would fail to foster mixed and balanced neighbourhoods where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP2 of the Council's Local Plan 2017, Policy H4, H5, H6 and H7 of the London Plan 2021.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of early stage financial viability reviews, would fail to ensure that affordable housing delivery has been maximised within the Borough and would set an undesirable precedent for future similar planning applications. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP2 of the Council's Local Plan 2017, Policy H4, H5, H6 and H7 of the London Plan 2021 and the Mayor of London's Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance document.
  3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) Three years free car club membership and £50 driving credit per residential unit. 3) Section 278 Highway Agreement for highway works for reconstruction of the vehicular crossover and adjacent footways. 4) A contribution towards enhancement of parking controls and 5) Implementation of a travel plan and monitoring free 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 is contrary to London Plan policies T1, and Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM48.
  4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team and to provide other employment initiatives 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 Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.
  5. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI 2 of the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
3. 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.

At 9.10pm, the Committee agreed a short adjournment. The meeting resumed at 9.15pm.

## **10. HGY/2022/0035 - LAND AT WATTS CLOSE, LONDON, N15 5DW**

The Committee considered an application for the 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.

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

- Some members enquired why the proposals on Lomond Close were not more in keeping with the existing units which had distinctive slatted wood on the upper level. The Planning Officer explained that there was design variation on Lomond Close and that the new developments would be of a high quality design with durable materials. The Principal Urban Design Officer added that there were a wide variety of appearances in the area and that the proposal aimed to be simple, clean, and well-proportioned.
- It was noted that that the two houses on Lomond Close had been listed as 3 bed and 4 bed properties but that they were both 4 bed properties. In relation to the differing heights of the existing and proposed houses, it was explained that the existing houses in Lomond Close had shallow, pitched roofs and that the proposed houses would have flat roofs with a 1.1 metre high parapet to allow solar panels to be located on the roof without affecting the skyline.
- In relation to air source heat pumps, it was enquired whether internal units were proposed, as suggested in the report. The Head of Development Management and Enforcement noted that air source heat pumps would require an external source of air but that this would not necessarily lead to noise issues; it was added the applicant may be able to confirm the arrangements.
- Some members expressed concern about the loss of the community hall. The Planning Officer noted that the council intended to make funding available for residents and local groups to use at West Green Methodist Church for up to five years. It was explained that this venue was 12 minutes' walk from the previous hall and that it could be used up to four times per year in accordance with the tenants' constitution. Some members considered that additional meetings should be available and that the offer should be in place for more than five years. It was accepted that the planning policy requirements were met but that it might be possible to support community groups through other council services.
- In response to a question about the number of replacement trees in this proposal compared to a previous proposal at Ramsey Court (HGY/2021/3522), the Principal Tree and Nature Conservation Manager explained that the tree canopy in this location was less substantial. It was noted that the proposals included high quality landscaping, more appropriate trees, and improved location of trees.
- It was noted that the affordable housing uplift proposed satisfied the council's policies.
- It was clarified that there was a typographical error on page 217 which stated that the front area of the development would 'exclude 2 blue badge parking bays'. It was highlighted that this should say 'include 2 blue badge parking bays'.

Lucia Durcatova spoke in objection to the application. She commented that the proposal would result in a loss of light and a loss of privacy due to the proximity of the building. It was noted that the community hall had already been knocked down because of anti-social behaviour problems. It was added that, during the demolition works on the community hall, there had been parking issues as four parking bays had been blocked off and no alternative parking was provided. It was stated that residents had only been given notice of the application two weeks' in advance which had not provided much time to respond to the proposal. It was explained that Seaford Road would be losing seven parking spaces and that there had been no time to address this problem.

Vivek Sunnassee spoke in objection to the application. He noted that he had submitted a petition with 28 grounds of objection and that 105 names had been collected in 24 hours. At the meeting, Vivek Sunnassee explained that he would focus on one ground of objection. He stated that the planning notification had been pre-dated by two weeks; he believed that this was done to give residents less time to respond. It was suggested that alternatives to development should have been considered, such as rebuilding the 11 bungalows with bricks to make them durable and to save on draining and infrastructure costs. Vivek Sunnassee believed that the Council had not been properly informed about the cost of the development. He stated that the most likely cost was between £2 million and £100 million, which was £51 million, and that this had not been compared to the cost of renovating the existing bungalows. He believed that the cost of each additional unit would be £9.4 million. He also stated that the road had been demolished without planning permission.

Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making, and Development, spoke in support of the application and stated that this scheme was part of an ambitious housebuilding programme and would deliver 18 new homes at council rent. It was added that there was significant demand for family homes and that a third of the homes provided would have three beds or more. It was stated that there would be two fully accessible and adaptable homes within the scheme. It was noted that the scheme would have solar panels, green roofs, low running costs, and high quality homes and that it would be built sympathetically to the surrounding area. The Cabinet Member commented that she did not recognise the figures that had been referenced by the objector.

Jack Goulde, Housing Project Manager; Jordan Perlman, Architect; Joe Todd, Landscape architect; Martin Cowie, Haringey Planning Advisor; and Robbie Erbmman, Assistant Director of Housing; addressed the Committee. Jack Goulde, Housing Project Manager, noted that the community hall previously located on the site had been out of use for some time and that the applicant had consulted with the former Chair of the Tenants' Association at length. It was explained that the hall had been demolished because of issues with asbestos, damp, and structural problems. Jordan Perlman, Architect, stated that the site presented an opportunity to provide homes that were needed. It was suggested that issues of access and anti-social behaviour had been addressed in the application and had been well received by the Quality Review Panel (QRP) and planning officers. It was added that the scheme aimed to provide high quality homes for those who needed them and that the homes would last for a long time.

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

- It was clarified that housing would be offered first to those who qualified for the Neighbourhood Moves Scheme and that those in temporary accommodation would be housed in accordance with the Temporary Accommodation Policy.
- In response to a question about co-production, Jack Goulde, Housing Project Manager, stated that there had been extensive discussions about design and landscaping with any residents who had expressed an interest.
- Some members expressed concerns about the design, the design response to the QRP's comments, and the general quality of Council schemes. Jordan Perlman, Architect, noted that design was subjective and that the design of this scheme was intended to be simple with the impression of quality and resilience, including deep brick reveals to windows, masonry surrounds, and balconies to provide visual interest. It was noted that the brick had been chosen to reflect the context of the site and that the scale and massing was considered to be in harmony with surrounding buildings. In addition, the balcony rails were angled to provide some screening and there was additional storage in the larger units.

At 9.58pm, the Committee considered whether it was minded to invoke Standing Order 63 to suspend Standing Order 18 so that the meeting could continue after 10pm; this was not agreed by the Committee. The Chair noted that the discussion of the specific item or case in hand at 10pm would continue at her discretion but that any remaining business would be deferred to a future meeting.

- Cllr Blake acknowledged the comments made by the applicant team about consultation and other matters but asked whether she could be provided with some additional information and clarification outside of the meeting. She asked for figures relating to consultation, why residents were saying that they had received letters two weeks' before the deadline, and information about car parking being obstructed. The Housing Project Manager noted that additional information could be provided. It was confirmed that there had been a number of consultation events where views had been recorded. In relation to the suspension of parking bays, it was believed that the contractor had applied for permission to use the spaces for the asbestos removal works.

Following a vote with 9 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 13/04/2022 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 resolution (2) 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/details submitted for approval
- 4) Energy strategy
- 5) Overheating
- 6) Living roofs
- 7) Biodiversity
- 8) Land contamination
- 9) Unexpected land contamination
- 10) Demolition management Plan (DMP)/ Construction Management Plan (CMP) incl. NRMM
- 11) Drainage/ SuDS
- 12) Drainage/ SuDS – Maintenance
- 13) Telecommunications apparatus/ S Dishes
- 14) Secure by design
- 15) Cycle storage
- 16) Refuse storage
- 17) Hard and soft landscaping including tree replacement
- 18) Electric vehicle charging points (EVCP)
- 19) Servicing and Delivery Plan
- 20) Obscure glazing
- 21) Piling/ Thames Water
- 22) Noise attenuation to ASHP and boundary with substation
- 23) Part M(2)

### **Informatives**

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



**Planning Obligations:**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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. Amending TMO for Car Free Development
  - The applicant must contribute a sum of £4,000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.
2. Employment skills provision
  - Provision of employment skills and support payment.
3. Social Rent
4. Car Club membership
5. Residential Travel Plan
6. Employment and skills plan
7. Considerate Contractors
8. Architect retention
9. S278 Highway work

**11. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS**

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

**12. PPA/2021/0018 - ST ANN'S**

*As the meeting had continued past 10pm, the consideration of this item was deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Sub-Committee.*

**13. PRE/2021/0193 141-147 STATION ROAD, LONDON, N22 7ST**

*As the meeting had continued past 10pm, the consideration of this item was deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Sub-Committee.*

**14. 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.

**15. 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.

**16. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

**17. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 17 March 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank