

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 6TH JUNE, 2022, 7.00 - 10.45 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Yvonne Say, and Councillor Matt White.

In attendance: Councillor Cathy Brennan, Muswell Hill ward; Councillor Scott Emery, Highgate ward; Councillor Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for House Building, Place-Making, and Development; Councillor Tammy Hymas, St Ann's ward; and Councillor Holly Harrison-Mullane, St Ann's ward.

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 George Dunstall and Councillor Alexandra Worrell.

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 March 2022 and 17 March 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/2021/2727 - CRANWOOD, 100 WOODSIDE AVENUE, LONDON, N10 3JA

The Committee considered an application for the 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.

Christopher Smith, Planning Officer, introduced the report and responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was confirmed that Passivhaus standards aimed to ensure energy efficiency in buildings.

David Staples spoke in objection to the application and noted that he was speaking on behalf of Woodside Square. He explained that, although there was support for the redevelopment of the site for mixed tenure housing, there were objections to the current and height and scale of the proposals. It was felt that the design would negatively contribute to the area and that the proposal to have a six storey building, where the majority of buildings in the area were three or four storeys, would fail to meet Council Policy DM1b which asked that developments related positively to the locality in terms of height, scale, and massing. David Staples stated that the design was not high quality and that it would include open corridors which was considered to be an outdated design concept with safety issues. It was felt that Building A would have a heavy mansard roof with excessive scale that would not replicate the small, articulated rooflines in the area. It was added that the proposal should be set back from the road, similar to other buildings in the area, to avoid an overpowering impact. David Staples stated that 93 of the 244 responses to the consultation objected to the proposal and that these comments had not been incorporated. It was requested that the development was sent back to the developer with a reduced brief so that the design could be addressed.

Mark Simons spoke in objection to the application and stated that a key issue with the application related to parking. It was noted that this was a car free development and that there should be basement parking, similar to Woodside Square, that there should be a central parking zone to prevent encroaching on surrounding roads, and that there should be an equal split of parking for local residents. It was added that the parking survey referenced in the report only related to evening parking but that there were issues during the day. It was felt that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) should be agreed with local residents in this case as there was no on site parking. Mark Simons stated that there had been a number of objections to applications on this site and that the current application did not address the issues raised. It was stated that the application should not be granted for reasons of overdevelopment and parking. If the application was granted planning permission, the Committee was asked to include a Section 106 legal agreement.

Cllr Cathy Brennan spoke in objection to the application. She stated that the majority of residents were in favour of more social housing and social rents but that there were objections in relation to size, massing, and the appearance which was considered out of character with the local area. She noted that it was important to coproduce with residents and felt that the Council should listen to residents. She explained that residents felt that the proposal should fit with the surrounding architecture, should incorporate different coloured brickwork into the façade, and should have additional greening to echo Highgate Wood. It was noted that the Friends of Parkland Walk consultation response raised concerns about Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) compliance and asked that there was an acoustic hoarding for construction as well as temporary drainage during construction to protect Parkland Walk. Cllr Cathy Brennan stated that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had advised on massing and density and had recommended that the views of Highgate Wood were protected. She commented that the style of Building A would be out of place in the local area and felt that the proposal would benefit from reduced massing and additional lightening.

Cllr Scott Emery spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Cllr Pippa Connor, ward councillor. It was noted that social housing was of vital importance and that it was good to see this provided on the site and it was stated that mixed tenure blocks should be provided as standard in proposals. It was noted that the main objection to the application was that there had been no changes in response to the consultation. It was stated that the design was not in keeping with the Edwardian design of the area and that the height and bulk of Block B was considered to be overly dominant in the conservation area. It was noted that, under Council Policy DM1, all developments must achieve high standard of design and contribute to the amenity and character of the area. It was argued that Block A contravened DM1 as it had a materially different height, bulk, and design to the area. In addition, it was commented that the proposal would result in 20 felled trees, risks from raised walkways, increased traffic in an area with several schools, and a lack of parking. It was also suggested that a more sympathetic design would be welcomed.

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

- Some members of the Committee enquired about the changes that had been made to the proposal. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the height of the proposal was considered to be compatible with some of the local context, particularly the rows of shops on Muswell Hill Road which were an established context for this height. It was explained that the site was outside of the conservation area and that the design aimed to reinterpret features of the neighbourhood which the applicant might be able to expand upon. It was added that the Local Planning Authority did not seek to impose strict design guidelines on developers but that the QRP agreed that the proposals had a good quality of design.
- In relation to the request for additional greening, Cllr Cathy Brennan clarified that she believed that the greening of the wall facing Parkland Walk would enhance the proposal and reduce the visual impact of the block.
- It was noted that the proposals had been considered by the QRP three times and that there had also been a physical site visit. It was explained that this was not

unknown but that there had been a thorough series of reviews and that this had included changes and improvements.

- In relation to the colours of the proposal, Cllr Cathy Brennan clarified that she understood that the building would be red but believed that more white elements would better reflect other designs in the Muswell Hill area.
- The Transport Planning Officer noted that the development was not eligible to be car free as the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) was 2. It was added that the site was not in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) so it was not possible to restrict street parking.

Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Place-Making, and Development, spoke in support of the application and stated that it was a Council development which would respond to significant housing need. It was noted that this site provided an opportunity to deliver council housing in the west of the borough. The Cabinet Member stated that the development would provide high quality homes, would be close to net zero carbon, and would be Passivhaus certified which was important for energy efficiency. The Committee was asked to support the proposal.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Jo McCafferty, Architect, stated that the proposals would provide high quality new homes in a key location. It was highlighted that the design would be mixed tenure and that the social rent homes would be fully Passivhaus certified. It was noted that the proposal had a strong landscape focus and that 830sqm, which was 21% of the site, would provide a new, green space. It was added that there would be a Parkland Walk access route with improved safety measures, including new lighting. The proposal would also include SUDS, parking for wheelchair users, and secure cycle parking.

It was stated that the scale of the buildings had been substantially reduced since the first QRP and that there had also been changes to materials and adjustments for the conservation area. It was explained that all units would have dual aspect and that, although gallery access was required, this had been carefully designed so that each gallery served a small number of homes. It was also noted that overlooking and privacy had been carefully considered with the Secure by Design officer. In relation to overlooking of schools, it was explained that the furniture had been built in away from the windows and that the glazing was set back.

Simon Keating, Transport Consultant, explained that there had been a Healthy Streets Transport Assessment to consider the suitability of the site to access local transport and amenities, such as the town centre, schools, and green spaces, and this aimed to support 15 minute neighbourhood. It was noted that the proposals included four disabled parking spaces and loading facilities and turning facilities on site. There was also a Sustainable Transport Plan, including plans to ensure access to local car pools.

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

- Some members enquired about the changes that had been made to the proposal in response to consultation. Jo McCafferty, Architect, explained that, during the pre-application process, the height of the buildings had been reduced. Following meetings with residents and the Friends of Parkland Walk, there had been refinements to the Landscape Strategy, to balcony design, and to include the

integration of paler materials. There had also been engagement with the local school to discuss the design of Building B and to discuss additional tree planting.

- In relation to the design of the frontages, the applicant team explained that providing larger front gardens would reduce the shared amenity space. It was also noted that the proposals aimed to work with the topography of the site to reduce the spoil and soil that would need to be removed from the site.
- Regarding the proximity of the school, some members noted that the built-in furniture could prevent overlooking but it was commented that this could be altered. The applicant team explained that most spaces overlooking the school were not primary, habitable rooms and would have high windowsills.
- The applicant team confirmed that refuse arrangements had been agreed with the Council's waste team and the operator, Veolia. The units would be served from Woodside Avenue and double lines on the road had been extended to ensure that there was sufficient room for refuse collection vehicles.
- In relation to parking, it was noted that the eight dwellings to the rear had no allocated parking. There were six marked bays for on plot parking which were informal and had been associated with the previous care home use. The applicant team noted that there had been a parking survey in October 2020. It was explained that the survey results indicated that there were likely to be approximately 34 spaces available during the early morning, when most residents were expected to be at home, and approximately 23 spaces during the day. It was stated that, based on these results, it was considered that it was suitable for the development to be low car or car free.
- It was clarified by the applicant team that residents had no rights to use the six marked parking bays but that the parking survey aimed to consider the impact of the development on parking, based on the 2011 parking census and availability in the area.
- It was confirmed that there was a designated Fire Consultant and a Fire Strategy for the development. It was added that the applicant had met with the Fire Brigade and with Building Control who had no objections to the arrangements.
- The Assistant Director for Housing clarified that a post-occupancy survey was standard for all developments and that the applicant would be happy to commit to this. The Head of Development Management suggested that this could be incorporated into Condition 20(c) to add the following wording: 'including a residents' survey to evidence this training and engagement'. The last sentence of Condition 20 would then read: 'This should include energy use data for the first year and a brief statement of occupant involvement, **including a residents' survey**, to evidence this training and engagement'. This was supported by the Committee.
- Some members raised concerns that, if the private homes were sold as freeholds, there would be no contributions to the area in terms of maintenance and other matters. The Assistant Director for Housing explained that efforts would be made to get the maximum possible contribution to amenity spaces but legislative restrictions were expected to be introduced shortly and so it would only be possible to confirm based on the legislative landscape when the houses were sold.
- It was noted that the scheme would result in a 90% reduction in carbon, rather than being carbon zero and that a financial offset would be applicable. The applicant team explained that there were challenges in designing a Passivhaus scheme in a sensitive site was complex. For example, it was noted that flat roofs

were better for Passivhaus but would not be particularly suitable for the context of the site. It was stated that the proposals aimed to achieve a balance.

- It was noted that the London Plan stated that major developments should be zero carbon. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that there was a preference for developments to be zero carbon on site but that, where this could not be achieved, there could be a financial payment which went into the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) fund.
- It was noted that there were some references to further development. The Head of Development Management explained the further development related to some requirements of the masterplan. Any proposal in part of an allocated site was required to demonstrate that the delivery of the site allocation and the wider objectives would not be compromised and the proposal was considered adequate in this regard.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison moved to defer the application. He stated that the addendum, which had been received shortly before the meeting, raised a number of significant questions. He also noted that there was a live police report, a court case, and an internal investigation in relation to the site and he did not think that it was appropriate to determine the case before the other investigations had concluded. It was added that a Local Government Ombudsman report had been published earlier in 2022 and that there was no confirmation that the Council had resolved all the points raised in this report. As it was not seconded, the motion was not passed.

The Legal Advisor commented that the Local Government Ombudsman case had been resolved and closed and it was considered that there had been a satisfactory response. The Legal Advisor was not aware of any court action in relation to the site.

Cllr Bevan noted that the addendum included a comment from an anonymous person and he did not believe that it was possible to accept anonymous comments. The Legal Advisor acknowledged that anonymous comments were not ordinarily accepted but that there were exceptional circumstances in this case where anonymity was considered to be justified.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum, and subject to the amendment of Condition 20(c) to include a residents' survey.

Following a vote with 8 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the commitment to provide the measures set out in para 2.10 of the report.
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 measures 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 commitments in resolution (1) above are to be confirmed in writing no later than 31st July 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; and
4. That, following the written confirmation referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

To Note

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. As this is a council scheme, it is not possible for planning obligations to be secured at this stage. In order to ensure so far as practicable that any requirements that would normally be secured through a s106 agreement are provided, it is proposed that appropriate planning conditions be imposed on the planning permission including a condition that will enable the LPA to secure any required planning obligations in the event that part or all the land is transferred to a third party.
7. It is recognised that the Council cannot commence to enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing any 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 permission 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.
9. Agreed measures:
 - Affordable housing/Social rented housing
 - Employment and Skills contribution and associated obligations
 - Highways works
 - TMO
 - Travel Plan
 - Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution - £3,000

- Car Club - a credit of £50 per annum for a period of three years from the Occupation Date in respect of each Residential Unit to the Occupiers of each Residential Unit up to a maximum of two
- Obligations monitoring fee

9. HGY/2021/3481 - 103-107 NORTH HILL, LONDON, N6 4DP

The Committee considered a full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home (Class C2 - Residential Institution), together with a well-being and physiotherapy centre. The proposed care home includes up to 70 bedrooms, with ancillary hydrotherapy pool, steam room, sauna, gym, treatment/medical rooms, hairdressing and beauty salon, restaurant, cafe, lounge, bar, well-being shop, general shop, car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, landscaping and associated works.

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

- The proposal provided traditional long term senior care and met the requirement of Council Policy DM15 to provide an adequate replacement for the existing care home – 70 bedrooms proposed with 43 bedrooms being replaced.
- The wellbeing and physiotherapy centre - 39% of the 70 bedrooms proposed met the requirement of Council Policy DM15 meeting an established local need and providing a standard of housing and facilities suitable for the intended occupiers.
- The proposal also met the requirements set out in the current Housing strategy as it would provide a more modern senior care home which was needs-based.
- The proposed basement plan accommodates 17 car parking spaces, cycle storage.
- The basement also accommodated the physiotherapy centre and other ancillary and servicing facilities.
- Each bedroom had its own en-suite bathroom with views to the rear or front garden.
- The resident facilities also had views onto the landscaped area.
- The primary access to the care home would be from View Road.
- The North Hill frontage would provide pedestrian access to the wellbeing and physiotherapy centre.
- The entrance to the wellbeing and physiotherapy centre was from North Hill and the entrance for servicing was from View Road.
- The first floor would be dedicated to older people's care. The second floor would be dedicated to dementia care. Both floors would include day space. The third floor was dedicated to the wellbeing centre only and provided convalescent stay accommodation.
- The quality and layout of the proposed accommodation was considered to be suitable for the intended occupiers in line with the requirements of Council Policy DM15.
- The proposed tree plan included the planting of 8 new trees which would replace the 7 trees that are of low quality.
- The set back distance plan highlighted the existing building outlined in red.

- The site itself and many of its neighbours were densely landscaped with existing trees to be retained and additional trees which also helped to reduce loss of privacy and overlooking.
- The proposal broadly followed the form and footprint of the existing building, with the proposed building line pulled away from boundaries to neighbouring gardens.
- The proposal also meets BRE daylight and sunlight guidance.
- The proposal was a high quality design of an appropriate scale to its context.
- It respected the visual amenity of the streetscape and locality generally and was supported by Conservation Team.
- It was confirmed that View Road would be the main access to the site for cars.
- It was enquired whether there had been an assessment of the need for specialist housing and whether this accorded with Council Policy DM15. The Planning Officer explained that the applicant had commissioned experts to assess demand and that, although there was good provision of traditional care homes in the area, they had identified strong demand for a nursing and convalescent home for recovery.
- The Planning Officer clarified that the application was classed as a care home with a small element of recovery use.
- It was noted that the design for the North Hill frontage had been amended and the applicant proposed to use yellow, buff brick.
- Some members noted that the images of the proposed yellow buff brick appeared to be quite bright and it was requested that matched the existing, Georgian houses in the area as much as possible. The Head of Development Management explained that the exact material would be secured by condition but that it would be possible to include an Informative. This was agreed by the Committee.
- It was clarified that the Tree Plan explained the constraints relating to the trees on site. It was noted that the Council's Tree Officer had assessed the scheme and was satisfied that the seven trees due to be removed were of low quality and would be replaced with eight new trees.

Aurell Taussig spoke in objection to the application and explained that his house was part of the Grade II Listed, Georgian terrace. He stated that the tall, North Hill block would run alongside his garden and would increase the sense of enclosure and would reduce sunlight in his garden by more than 50%. He stated that this would be a significant breach of the guidelines on sunlight which stated that a new development could take away no more than 20% of a neighbour's sunlight. He noted that only one fifth of his garden would have sunlight and that the windows would have reduced levels of light; the high wall would also result in reduced views of the sky. Aurell Taussig explained that the report stated that his garden was currently overshadowed by buildings and trees but that the guidance and policy advised that trees should be ignored. He had asked for his points to be addressed in the addendum to the report but did not consider that this had been done. It was noted that high brick walls with additional windows, that would overlook residential properties, were proposed and that this would have an overbearing and dominant presence. The houses on Yeatman Road would also lose sunlight to the extent that there would be a breach of the guidelines. It was added that the large basement would require excavation works which would cause cracking and would risk damage to properties. Aurell Taussig commented that his structural engineer had advised that the applicant had not dug the correct type or number of boreholes and had not tested the site in wet conditions.

which could put his property at risk of flooding. It was stated that the proposal was out of scale with its neighbours, breached conservation area policies, would negatively impact amenity, and would cause structural damage. It was also considered that the proposal would cause harm to the Listed building and that the application should be refused.

David Richmond spoke in objection to the application on behalf of the Highgate Society and the Highgate Conservation Advisory Committee. He showed a photo of the previous objector's garden which included a red outline of the proposal. It was noted that there would be a four storey extension along the whole garden, that the site was in the conservation area, that the impacted property was Grade II Listed and should be protected. It was also considered that there would be a negative impact on the nearby housing estate and that there would be little public benefit. It was requested that a small percentage of the building was removed so that the scheme would be more acceptable. Specifically, it was requested that the North Hill Block was slightly lower to reduce the impact on the area and that there was no basement which presented a risk to the Listed, terraced houses.

David Sheinman spoke in objection to the proposal. He showed photos of the proposal. He stated that he would support a new, proportionate scheme that protected his privacy and amenity. He noted that two of the key recommendations in the report were that there would be no adverse impacts on the highway network and that the impact on amenity would be acceptable; he considered that there was no evidence to support these statements. It was stated that the proposal would render parts of View Road single file as parking bays on both sides of the road would be needed to accommodate the development; it was considered that this would lead to traffic on North Hill and would be dangerous for schoolchildren. It was suggested that the application should be rejected on this point alone. In relation to amenity and privacy, he noted that the Council's policy required developments to ensure high standards of privacy and amenity for neighbours and he did not believe that his amenity or the issue of overlooking had been properly considered in the report. There would be 10 new bedrooms and bedroom windows and eight of these were shown in the picture provided. It was noted that a number of councils had minimum distances between windows of habitable rooms in blocks; this was generally always 21 metres but the proposal was due to be 12.5 metres from the objector's main living area and 13.5 metres from the dining room. It was added that the proposal would be considered to be more acceptable if it was reduced to provide approximately 55 units.

Cllr Scott Emery spoke in objection to the application on behalf of local residents. He stated that there were a number of objections to the proposal which was not considered to preserve the character of the area. It was noted that residents had raised concerns about the size of the development, imposing nature, and loss of light. It was commented that there were guidelines in place and that these should not be disregarded. There were concerns that a Basement Impact Assessment was not originally included with the application and about whether there was sufficient consideration of boreholes. It was considered that the proposal felt rushed and that it would have an unacceptable impact on local residents.

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

- The site was located in a conservation area.
- In relation to daylight and sunlight, Aurell Taussig explained that the Daylight and Sunlight Report showed that three of the 12 properties tested failed a Sun-on-Ground Test and, for his property, this was by a large margin.
- In relation to the suggestion that properties would be affected by cracking, Aurell Taussig stated that his comments were based on the Basement Impact Assessment. He commented that he had obtained advice from a structural engineer who had noted that the property would experience unacceptable cracking. It was added that the building that was due to be demolished was not a Grade II Listed building but adjoined Grade II Listed buildings which had been built in 1811 and did not have any foundations. He stated that Council Policy DM9 needed to be upheld.
- The Conservation Officer noted that there had been extensive pre-application discussions which had considered all heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. It was stated that the height of the building had been reduced and set back further from the Listed terraces. The proposals and the scale had not changed significantly but had been readjusted. In relation to conservation, it was considered that the North Hill elevation improved the townscape. It was added that the issues relating to basement development and amenity were part of the holistic assessment of the application and not necessarily specific to conservation. The Conservation Officer said that the proposal improved the landscape as the highest point of the proposal property was further back from the terrace than the highest point currently.
- The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that there were two conditions proposed in relation to basement development and that this was addressed in the report. It was added that the Committee could consider some elements of basement development but that some issues were covered in other legislation, such as the Building Regulations. It was also noted that Building Control had been consulted and had no objections at this stage, although any works would be subject to the provision of additional details.
- The Planning Officer clarified that the windows facing the rear garden on North Hill were hallway windows. The windows facing 1A View Road were first floor bedroom windows. At second floor level, there were no windows as there would be a flat roof and no additional floor was proposed here as there was an enclosed terrace. David Sheinman stated that there would be five new windows opposite 1A View Road and that it was not possible to use obscured glass in habitable rooms.
- In relation to a query about the retention of the existing block, the Planning Officer noted that the applicant had considered this but that it could not be appropriately adapted to provide a modern care facility.
- It was clarified that the proposed basement excavation works would be subject to further approval, including approval from Building Control. The Head of Development Management commented that Condition 26 related to the monitoring of construction work and that this could be enhanced to request the submission of the design of the basement, including groundwater. The Committee agreed that this would be beneficial.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Mitesh Dhanak (Highgate Care) stated that he had worked in the care sector for over 25 years around the UK and in Haringey since 2008. It was regrettable that the previous care home had been lost but it was noted that there had been financial issues and that the current proposal

would support 90 new jobs, would retain a care home, and would modernise the rooms available. It was noted that, based on the demand demonstrated during the consultation process, the application had accommodated long term care home use and an additional 27 rooms for convalescent care. Mitesh Dhanak stated that he did not accept the objections that there were unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties given the comments from the Council, the Quality Review Panel (QRP), and Historic England.

Neeraj Dixit (ND Planning) stated that the proposals had a high quality design and had undergone two years' of pre-application discussions to ensure that a number of planning requirements were met, particularly to be in keeping with the context and there was no objection from Historic England. It was explained that the proposal broadly followed the previous building footprint and would be set back from sensitive boundaries. Neeraj Dixit stated that the scheme would replace Truscott House, which was identified as a negative feature in the conservation area. He added that the design approach was considered to be sensitive and well-founded, would have a high quality landscaping approach with a net increase in trees, and was designed to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties. In relation to daylight and sunlight, the proposal achieved a 98% pass rate against Vertical Skyline Component (VSC) guidelines and 99% against No Skyline guidelines and it was commented that this was considered to be good for London. It was stated that, in addition to a Basement Impact Assessment and ground conditions, there would be ongoing assessments to ensure that the works were safe.

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

- Some members enquired whether the proposal would include work experience opportunities. Neeraj Dixit (ND Planning) noted that the applicant has expressed willingness to include work experience opportunities and was happy to include this within the section 106 agreement. The Head of Development Management recommended that the intention could be achieved through an amendment to Head of Term 4, bullet points two, three, and four, to clarify that this should be done 'during and following construction'. This was agreed by the Committee.
- It was enquired whether the percentage of the workforce that would be Haringey residents could be increased. Neeraj Dixit (ND Planning) noted that the recommendation was to delegate the exact wording of conditions to officers and he stated that the applicant was happy to discuss this.
- In relation to the impact of the proposal on the residential properties that had been mentioned, the Principal Urban Design Officer stated that 109 North Hill was the only property with significant loss of sunlight. This primarily impacted the garden which was already not compliant with Building Research Establishment (BRE) standards. It was added that the overlooking windows would serve corridors and would be obscured glass. It was noted that no properties would have any significant loss of daylight and there were a small number of properties on Yeatman Road with an impact on daylight and sunlight. No properties had a significant loss of daylight and it was only 109 North Hill that would lose significant sunlight. This sunlight would be lost in the garden and not in the rooms. The garden of this property was not well sunlit at present and was already below the guidance. It was suggested that there would not be an adverse impact on privacy as the windows were from corridors and would have obscured glass. The applicant

added that the issue was that there would be additional shadowing in the rear garden of 109 North Hill.

- In relation to 1A View Road, the Planning Officer explained that the proposal would increase the height of the building by one storey but would be further set back from the existing building line. The Head of Development Management noted that the general guidance for overlooking was a distance of 18 metres. However, it was highlighted that there was already overlooking and therefore an assessment must be mindful of the privacy the garden enjoyed at the moment and the Committee must judge whether the additional overlooking was any worse. He noted that the separation distances would increase but would still not meet the guidelines, although the current arrangement also did not meet these guidelines. It was added that the 18 metre guideline was based on suburban locations, whereas this was a more dense area with close relationships. With this in mind, officers did not consider the overlooking to be significant enough to refuse on this basis.
- Some members enquired about the sunlight and daylight impact of the proposal, particularly in relation to the points raised in the objections. The Head of Development Management explained that there were a number of different tests, standards, and comparisons. It was noted that the proposal passed some tests and failed some tests but that the proposal had to be assessed in the round.
- In relation to the design and heritage impact, the Principal Urban Design Officer stated that the proposal had an intelligent design and it was considered that the North Hill and View Road frontages adapted to and responded well to the surroundings.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that there had been some amendments:

- In relation to the Committee's request to include enhanced monitoring of construction works of the proposed basement, the Head of Development Management proposed the inclusion of an additional condition, Condition 38, to include groundwater, end flows, and impacts measured on the Burland scale. It was asked that the final wording of Condition 38 was delegated to the Head of Development Management, after consultation with the Chair.
- The amendment of Head of Term 4, bullet points two, three, and four, to clarify that this should be done 'during and after construction':
 - Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies **during and following construction;**
 - 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents **during and following construction;**
 - 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees **during and following construction.**
- To include an Informative in relation to Condition 3 to request that, as much as possible, the proposed yellow buff brick matched the existing, Georgian houses in the area.

It was noted that the recommendation was to grant planning permission as set out in the report and the addendum and subject to the changes noted above.

Following a vote with 8 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 1 abstention, and subject to the amendments above, 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 informatics 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 & 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 (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 06/08/22 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; 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.

As set out in the report and above.

5. In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.
6. 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 1) Section 278 Highway Agreement for reinstatement of redundant crossover in North Hill at the former access and meet all of the Council's costs. 3) A contribution towards parking management measures. 4) A contribution towards permit free with respect to the issue of Business Permits for the CPZ. 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, Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32, DM48 and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policies TR3 and TR4.
 2. 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.

3. 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.
7. 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.

10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

11. PPA/2021/0018 - ST ANN'S GENERAL HOSPITAL, ST ANN'S ROAD, N15 3TH

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for hybrid planning application for the re-development of part of the St Ann's Hospital site to provide a new residential neighbourhood of circa 995 new homes including 60% affordable housing in buildings up to nine storeys in height, 2,400sqm of non-residential uses (including refurbishment of existing buildings), landscaping and public realm improvements, 160 parking spaces and cycle parking.

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

- Some members enquired about the location and safety of the main vehicular entrance to the site and any mitigations. The applicant team stated that moving the entrance had been considered but would create issues with the nearby ambulance station or would result in an entrance closer to junctions or dense foliage in the conservation area. It was explained that safety audits had been undertaken and it was considered that the current proposal was the best available main access point to the site.
- In relation to the location of taller blocks and concerns of residents in Warwick Gardens, the applicant team noted that the highest building in Phase 1a would be nine storeys and would be located approximately 90 metres from Warwick Gardens. It was added that the tallest building would be located close to open space and that its building footprint had been reduced to ensure the retention of an

existing tree on site. In relation to alternative locations for the building, it was stated that the proposed location was the optimum location to minimise overshadowing.

- The applicant team noted that they supported the maximisation of walking and cycling opportunities on the site. It was added that the inclusion of a south to west link was a key part of the proposal and would be a link from the main masterplan site to Warwick Gardens.
- In terms of green spaces, the applicant team noted that the St Ann's new neighbourhood site was located near Chestnuts Park but did not seek to compete with this space about would provide a different type of space with more greenery and more intricate spaces.
- It was confirmed that the applicant would be retaining the wall on site but, based on feedback from consultation, would be creating a number of new openings for site access and visibility.
- In relation to a query about the water tower, the applicant team confirmed that they had consulted extensively with the local community and a variety of uses had been considered. It was explained that this was still being determined but would not be a residential use. It was confirmed that the applicant would manage all maintenance standards on site, with the exception of any internal parts should the Council decide to take up its option to purchase.
- It was confirmed that the owner of the building would be responsible for service charges.
- In response to a query about the height and detailed design of the proposal, the applicant team believed that nine storeys would fit comfortably on the site. It was added that there was some variety between buildings and that this was often considered to be subtle. It was highlighted that the applicant team had examined the settings of all buildings and considered that the design was contextual and contemporary.

Cllr Hymas spoke as ward councillor and noted that there would be 167 car parking spaces with a maximum of 10% of these spaces for disabled people. It was commented that, under the London Plan, there was an expectation that developments would be car free and it was queried why the proposal would provide this level of parking. It was added that the homes in the development would be 60% affordable and that car ownership levels were expected to be low. It was suggested that a much lower level of parking could be provided, particularly given the nearby location of schools and local support of reduced car usage.

The applicant team commented that the development proposed 167 car parking spaces, which amounted to 0.17 of parking spaces per home. It was noted that the area had a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL). It was explained that the London Plan policy proposes 3-7% of the total number of spaces for accessible spaces, with a maximum of 10%, which meant that up to 100 accessible spaces could be provided on site. It was also noted that 17% of the units would be 3-bed and 4-bed homes and were expected to require access to a vehicle at times and there were also some requirements for vehicles that people used for work purposes. The applicant team considered that the proposal achieved a balance which would be supplemented by car clubs, a transport assessment, and a car parking management plan.

Cllr Harrison-Mullane spoke as ward councillor and enquired how the proposal would interact with the District Energy Network (DEN). It was noted that residents were supportive of including a higher number of solar panels as part of the scheme. It was also commented that some residents had expressed safety concerns about the near entrance onto Warwick Gardens. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that the DEN was not specific to this proposal but was a wider, Council project to provide decentralised energy. It was noted that a decision on the outline business case had been made at Cabinet report in December 2021. The applicant team stated that provision would be made on site if a connection to the DEN became available but that, in the interim, air source heat pumps were proposed and would be supplemented by solar panels. It was added that the scheme planned to have a significant number of solar panels on the roof space. In relation to the pedestrian entrance, the applicant team felt that this would provide a number of wider benefits to the community around access to and through the site. It was added that the applicant was incorporating safety considerations into the design of the site and was working with the Police Secured by Design officer.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 14 June 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date