

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 11TH JULY, 2022, 7.00 PM – 9.30 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Pippa Connor, Councillor George Dunstall, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Yvonne Say, Councillor Matt White, and Alexandra Worrell.

In attendance: Councillor Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council Housebuilding, Placemaking, 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 Luke Cawley-Harrison. Councillor Pippa Connor was present as substitute.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 7, HGY/2022/0752 – Council Depot, Ashley Road, N17 9DP, Cllr Rice stated that he intended to take part in the discussion but did not intend to vote on the item. He noted that he did not have any pecuniary interests. Cllr Rice clarified that he would speak as a ward councillor in relation to the application. It was confirmed that he would not be taking part in the discussion or voting on this item and would leave the room after his submission, whilst the application was being discussed.

Cllr Rice enquired why the Committee was not considering the minutes of the last meeting. The Chair noted that the minutes would be circulated when they were available.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted.

7. HGY/2022/0752 - COUNCIL DEPOT, ASHLEY ROAD, N17 9DP

Cllr Rice moved to the public seating area.

The Committee considered an application for full planning permission for the erection of 272 homes including 50% socially rented homes extending 4-13 storeys, 174sqm of flexible Use Class E floorspace along with a new vehicular access to the site, car parking and two pedestrian north south routes. The proposal also includes both private and public hard and soft landscaping throughout the site.

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

- It was noted that there was a proposed requirement for the applicant to undertake an archaeological investigation. The Head of Development Management explained that any findings would not necessarily stop a development but would require certain processes to be followed.
- Some members of the Committee commented that some floors within the proposal would exceed the recommended number of homes per core set out in Standard 12 of the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The Principal Urban Design Officer highlighted that the report should say units per floor per core rather than units per core. It was explained that, although some floors slightly exceeded the guidance, the proposal would be well-lit and well-ventilated and would avoid having long corridors.
- The Planning Officer stated that the proposed play space for under 5s was marginally below the play space estimate. However, it was explained that residents of the proposed development would be able to access 'play on the way' features located on key public routes in the area and these spaces would mean that the play space estimate would be exceeded.
- Some members enquired why the scheme would have some visitor parking but would exclude residents from applying for parking permits. The Transport Planning Team Manager explained that the Council's standard position was to seek car free developments where residents could not apply for parking permits. It was noted that visitor parking had less of a permanent impact and it was considered that this could be accommodated in the surrounding streets.
- In relation to concerns about vehicular dominance caused by the proposal, the Transport Planning Team Manager noted that the applicant would be required to submit Vehicular Access Control Arrangements. It was added that the scheme was a limited car development and that the site would be monitored for a period of five years; this would be secured by legal agreement.
- Some members noted that the Greater London Authority (GLA) had previously commented that they would not support the loss of a waste site in this area and it was enquired whether this had been resolved. The Planning Officer explained that there had been discussions with the GLA Waste Team and there was in principle agreement that the arguments in the report were accepted by the GLA.

It was noted that the application would be considered by the GLA formally in their Stage 2 comments.

- It was noted that legal requirements would normally be secured by section 106 legal agreements but it was enquired how this would be secured when the applicant was the Council. The Head of Development Management explained that the requirements would be secured through an exchange of letters between the relevant Council departments.
- The Planning Officer noted that social rent homes and market rent homes were generally in different blocks that were accessed by a single core for management reasons, such as maintaining a lower service charge for social rent homes. It was clarified that all residents would have the same access to amenities and open spaces.

Cllr Rice spoke in relation to the application to raise his concerns. He stated that the development was located on a substantial piece of land and he felt that there was a missed opportunity to have a park in this area. He commented that he welcomed housing but queried whether there would be sufficient recreational facilities. Cllr Rice stated that there had been insufficient consultation of people in the local area. He also noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had stated that it would support clarity on entrances to ensure that natural desire lines were reinforced; he stated that this was confusing and he asked for clarity.

The Principal Urban Design Officer explained that the QRP had suggested clarity on the hierarchy of entrances in the proposal. It was stated that there was a hierarchy and that building entrances were located on main routes within the site.

In relation to the comments about consultation, the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that the local representations were set out on page 10 of the agenda pack. It was stated that notification letters had been sent out as required and that comments had been received. It was added that the applicant was also required to undertake their own consultation and might provide further detail about this.

Cllr Ruth Gordon, Cabinet Member for Council House Building, Place-Making, and Development, spoke in support of the application. It was noted that there had been two full consultations for the application which had been well attended by stakeholders in the ward. It was explained that a community group had been established for Down Lane Park in order to inform the redesign of the park. It was explained that this group would not be able, under its terms of reference, to comment on neighbouring developments but it was stated that there had been a positive reaction to the scheme.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Jo McCafferty, architect, stated that the development had a strong landscape focus and that 25% of the site would be green space. It was added that the scheme also resolved some difficult issues on the edge of Down Lane Park. It was noted that a number of trees would be provided across the site, that there would be Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), and that the Urban Greening Factor (UGF) exceeded the Greater London Authority (GLA) requirements.

At this point, Cllr Rice left the room.

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

- Some members expressed concerns about the quantity of play space proposed in the scheme. Jo McCafferty, architect, stated that there was an intention to have a number of play opportunities as part of the development, and that this would be conditioned, but it was not quantified in the play space calculations. It was added that there would be an overprovision of play space for children aged 0-11 and that there would be a financial contribution for play space for those aged 11 and over which would be co-produced with local residents.
- Some members of the Committee asked whether the scheme could provide an opportunity to address the nearby underpass access to Lee Valley. The Assistant Director of Housing noted that the application would result in significant contributions, including financial contributions, affordable housing, and family sized units. It was suggested that the access to Lee Valley was a larger issue and might need to be addressed outside of this scheme.
- It was confirmed that the private properties would be leasehold. It was added that the parking spaces would be available for 3-bed and 4-bed homes which were all social rent and accessible homes.
- Regarding lifts and fire safety, Jo McCafferty, architect, noted that all buildings with accessible homes would have two lifts and other buildings would have one lift. It was explained that buildings over 18 metres high would have firefighting shafts and lifts and all buildings lower than 18 metres would have a dry riser which would enable access to firefighters and their equipment. It was added that the fire safety arrangements were in accordance with emerging guidance.
- In response to questions about cycle parking, the applicant team clarified that the scheme would provide secure cycle parking in excess of the GLA requirements. It was explained that the cycle parking would be distributed across the development and that it was aimed to provide a number of secure, internal areas.
- In relation to bike ownership rates, the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability noted that there were some wider council schemes to support bike ownership, such as the Try Before You Buy bike scheme and the Walking and Cycling Action Plan.
- Following a question about materials, Jo McCafferty, architect, noted that the vast majority of the proposal would have brick elevations and pre-cast concrete would be used in minimal areas to highlight lintels or for banding in elevations. It was stated that the colour palette matched the adjacent context. It was highlighted that the development would use glazed bricks, rather than ceramic tiles as stated in the report. It was noted that a small quantity of glazed bricks would be used to mark key openings in the development and it was added that these materials could be wiped clean.
- In relation to the balcony design, the applicant team explained that the banisters would be angled so that, from certain directions, they would appear solid. It was stated that the applicant had aimed to design buildings that worked well together. It was added that the application had been considered twice by the Quality Review Panel (QRP), that there had been significant contact with the Planning Team, and that the design had evolved in line with the advice and guidance received.

- Jo McCafferty, architect, clarified that the scheme would not be completely Passivhaus certified. It was explained that some of the proposed buildings were smaller and would not have flat roofs for contextual reasons and that this meant that achieving full Passivhaus certification was almost impossible.
- Some members of the Committee enquired about the changes that had been made to the proposal in response to consultation. The Housing Planning Officer noted that, following the first round of consultation, the height of the building on Park View Road had been reduced by one storey. Jo McCafferty, architect, added that, following consultation with the QRP, Planning Department, and residents, the proposed sawtooth roof had been simplified and would now run alongside the surrounding trees rather than significantly higher.
- In relation to the proposed building design on the corner of Park View, Havelock, and Dowsett Roads, the Principal Urban Design Officer explained that it was considered important to have a building in this location that could hold the corner. It was added that the building was considered to be of high quality design.
- In relation to a question about the accessibility of the units, the applicant team confirmed that the relevant units would be fully accessible and would include strengthened joists. The Assistant Director of Housing added that the council had a bespoke housing programme which identified specific residents and designed homes that were specific to their needs.
- In response to a question, the Assistant Director of Housing confirmed that the applicant would be conducting a post-occupancy resident survey and would be happy to condition this. It was noted that the condition wording was used in another recent application, HGY/2021/2727 - Cranwood, 100 Woodside Avenue, London, N10 3JA, and could be replicated for this application.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum and subject to an additional condition to require a post-occupancy resident survey.

Following a vote with 8 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 2 abstentions, 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 informatics subject to the signing of a legal 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 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 31st August 2022 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 (3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
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. 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.
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 Placemaking and Housing 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. Summary of the planning obligations for the development is provided below:
 - Affordable housing – 136 homes at Council rents
 - Parking permit restrictions
 - TMO amendments (£5,000)
 - Travel plan monitoring (£10,000)
 - CPZ review and amendments (£20,000)
 - Car club contributions
 - Off-site highway works
 - Improvements to public realm east and west of Down Lane Park (£120,000)
 - Improvements to Park View Road underpass, including lighting (£140,000)
 - Contribution towards North Tottenham Low Traffic Neighbourhood (£50,000)
 - Monitoring of construction works (£20,000)
 - Community-led site hoarding design (£5,000)
 - Community plant growing initiatives (£10,000)
 - Carbon offsetting contribution (£145,350)
 - Play space contribution (£172,738.50)

- Metropolitan Police contribution (£21,296.42)
- Employment and Skills plan and measures
- Employment and Skills management and apprenticeship support contribution (£76,923.59)

Cllr Rice did not take part in the voting and re-entered the room at the end of the item.

At 8.30pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment. The meeting resumed at 8.45pm.

8. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

9. PPA/2022/0006 - HORNSEY POLICE STATION, 98 TOTTENHAM LANE, N8 7EJ

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the retention of existing Police Station building (Block A) with internal refurbishment, rear extensions and loft conversions to create 6 terrace houses and 4 flats. Erection of two buildings comprising of Block C along Glebe Road and Harold Road to create 8 flats and erection of Block B along Tottenham Lane and towards the rear of Tottenham Lane to create 7 flats and 4 mews houses including landscaping and other associated works.

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

- The Committee noted that the police station was a community use building and that, under Council Policy DM49, there was a requirement to seek alternative community uses for the building, including through marketing; it was enquired whether this had been undertaken. The applicant team stated that the pre-application had outlined the change of use and had been supported and it was believed that no further marketing was required in relation to DM49. The applicant team explained that the police station was considered to be sui generis use rather than community use. The Head of Development Management noted that this would require confirmation.
- In relation to the elevations and pitched roof, the applicant team explained that the application did not aim to create a pastiche or replicate existing buildings in the area. It was stated that the design was more contemporary and that the proposed undulations took inspiration from the local context.
- Regarding resident concerns about daylight, the applicant team stated that there had been a daylight and sunlight assessment. It was noted that all Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines had been met and that there would be no infringements for overshadowing on neighbouring properties.

- It was confirmed that the affordable housing provision, including type and tenure, was provisional. The current proposal was to have eight affordable units, subject to the conclusion of the viability assessment.
- The applicant team noted that a transport assessment and parking stress survey had been conducted which found that there were sufficient parking spaces. It was clarified that only the 12 family sized units would have access to parking.
- Some members of the Committee expressed concerns that waste would be collected from the roadside which would have a negative impact on the nearby junction. The applicant team stated that waste collection was currently from the roadside and it was proposed to maintain this. It was added that introducing waste collection from within the site would negatively impact the landscaping and greening of the site. It was added that the number of bin stores had been calculated in line with the Council's requirements.
- The applicant team clarified that some changes had been made to the design of the proposal in response to comments from the Quality Review Panel (QRP). It was noted that Block C now included different brick treatment, dormers, and low level planting in order to look more interesting.
- In response to a question about conservation and resident views, the applicant team stated that a heritage consultant had been used and a heritage assessment had been drafted. It was noted that a number of comments had been received throughout the process, including strong, positive feedback for Blocks B and C. It was stated that design was subjective and that some people had requested more traditional design whilst others had requested more architecturally styled design. The applicant team explained that the proposed design was informed by the design context, feedback from residents, and feedback from the Planning Team.
- In relation to internal landscaping, the applicant team noted that there would be seating areas on raised sculptural forms and it was aimed to have a congregation space. It was highlighted that all units would have access to these areas and that there would be natural surveillance through overlooking of the communal area.
- Some members enquired whether the Committee would be able to consider examples of finished materials in order to make a decision. The Head of Development Management explained that materials would only be brought before the Committee if they were of fundamental importance.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

10. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 21 July 2022.