

## **ADDENDUM REPORT**

### **UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8**

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2021/2727	<b>Ward:</b> Muswell Hill
<b>Address:</b> Cranwood, 100 Woodside Avenue, N10 3JA	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to provide 41 new homes (Use Class C3) within 3 buildings ranging from 3 to 6 storeys in height, with associated vehicular access from Woodside Avenue, wheelchair parking, landscaping, refuse/recycling and cycle storage facilities. New stepped access to Parkland Walk from Woodside Avenue.	

### **Additional Neighbour Consultation Responses**

Two additional letters of objection have been received – one from 13 Stanley Road and one from an anonymous stakeholder who would like the record corrected with regard to certain details in relation to 8th March, 2022 Cabinet report regarding this site (see Appendix A below for a copy of these anonymous comments). The Council does not usually accept anonymous representations but in the context of the recent Local Government Ombudsman (LGO) review of Council processes (which has now been resolved) an exception is being made in this case.

The total number of objections/comments is now 231.

Summary of material considerations raised by these two objections:

- Increased overlooking
- Increased pollution
- Lack of car parking
- Increased traffic congestion
- Negative impacts from construction works

An assessment of these material considerations has already been provided within the case officer's report)

Summary of non-material considerations:

- Matters relating to the acquisition of nearby property

### **Additional Paragraph to the Report**

#### **Other Considerations**

In respect of the recent comments relating to the acquisition of property near to this application site, the Local Government Ombudsman wrote to the Council on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2022, stating that: *"We welcome the action your Council has taken following the*

*report on [name redacted]'s complaint. This letter is therefore to tell you formally we are satisfied with the Council's response in accordance with section 31(2) of the Local Government Act 1974. We have recorded a compliance outcome of Remedy complete and satisfied."*

This matter is not a material planning consideration relevant to the assessment of this planning application. The matter is now closed as stated by the LGO in their comments above.

### **Other Amendments to the Officer Report**

#### *Amendments to Paragraph 2.7*

This paragraph ends with the words: "*A draft s106 agreement will be attached to the condition.*" This is a typographical error within the report as it is not possible to attach a s106 to this application as explained in para 2.7. The agreed planning obligations will be secured by other means for this application as described in paras 2.6-2.10 of the case officer's report.

As such, this sentence must be deleted.

## Appendix A

An anonymous stakeholder who would like the record to be corrected with regards to certain details has set out the following-

To be clear, the comments relate to the report to cabinet-here:

<https://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/g9831/Public%20reports%20pack%2008th-Mar-2022%2018.30%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

The specific corrections relate to the report starting on p449, agenda item 17-the report prepared by council officers, authorised by David Joyce.

### **Here are the misleading statements in the report to cabinet:**

"1.6 The Council exchanged contracts for the acquisition of 106 Woodside Avenue in December 2018 and completed the acquisition in June 2019 for £2.15m"

This misrepresents history of the acquisition process. The council engaged with the owner of 106 Woodside Ave in summer of 2018 at the very least, as noted in the LGO report. The council even arranged a valuation of 106 in early August.

"1.7 The Council was unable to complete its negotiations on 104 Woodside Avenue as the owner had entered into an 'Option Agreement' with a developer in August 2018, which meant the Council could not acquire the property directly from the freehold owner until the option period had ended."

This is misleading. The owners of 104 Woodside Avenue tried to contact the council in April 2018 to ask if the council were interested in purchasing our property. The council had several months notice to express an interest in acquiring the property, as they appear to have done with the owner of 106.

p453 "5.2.3 ... In this option, as well as option 3, we have assumed that it would cost us £1.75m to purchase Mr X's property as this is the most recent offer that he has made us"

Mr X never made an 'offer' nor was ever asked what price was acceptable to him. So this is a false assumption, and misrepresents the facts.

"The Council was unable to acquire 104 Woodside Avenue for the reasons set out in this report." Again—this is false. The council failed to acquire 104 because it selectively and unfairly engaged with the owner of 106 but not the owners of 104 in the summer of 2018. This failure to act fairly allowed a developer to obtain an option on 104. But it is quite wrong to suggest the option prevented acquisition. Indeed, in autumn 2018 the council began a legal process that would have committed it to acquiring 104 after the option expired in 2020.

**I would also like to alert councillors to the substance of the report, which fails to fairly consider all possible options for development but instead builds on this misleading picture to rule out all other options except the one they are being asked to consider, which would see the 1970s terrace of houses immediately adjacent to the site not redeveloped.**

"8.6 ...The Council was unable to acquire 104 Woodside Avenue for the reasons set out in this report."

Again --for the reasons stated above --this is false. The council had multiple opportunities to acquire 104 but its officers chose not to enter into discussions with the owners while progressing plans to purchase 106. This led to the purchase of 106 for £2.15m. The question of why they did this, and whether their decision to treat one owner so obviously preferentially remains unresolved.

"8.12 There may be some potential negative impacts of the development of the Cranwood site, principally relating to Options 2 and 3 of the report, these two options would require the decanting of seven tenanted properties and some of the tenants in these properties have protected characteristics, specifically disabilities which could have a negative impact on them."

The council's efforts to help the handicapped belie the fact that they intend to build 2 3-storey houses on the parking spaces associated with the current terrace for over 50 years--thus eliminating parking spots used currently by elderly and disabled residents. The council's current plan is to replace c.12-15 parking spots with 2 disabled spots, which will not be able to accommodate any new or existing handicapped/elderly residents.

Moreover, elimination of the existing parking spots will create another problem: parents of St James's school students currently use these parking spaces at drop off and pick up. This creates significant congestion in the car park. The council has not explained how, with these spaces gone, congestion on Woodside Ave will be eased at these hours.

In short, this report categorically fails to explain how the scheme to develop the whole site was considered highly 'financially advantageous' just 5 years ago, and worth paying one owner £2.15m for—but is now no longer 'financially advantageous' nor meets the council's goals. There is no thorough reappraisal of the options, partly because the officers have failed to explain why a water mains running through the land was missed in the early stages of appraising the site. The current false narrative revolves around covering up past failures in planning and the strange purchase of 106 but not 104.

Having fewer floors, ensuring the new flats are a mix of council and private homes in both buildings, and redeveloping the terrace would create a high quality scheme that would be a better fit to the area, capitalise on the prime land currently occupied by the 50+ year old terrace, and help to resolve parking issues. Please scale it back, address parking issues and improve the quality of the development.