

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 14TH JUNE, 2022, 7.00 - 8.30 PM

PRESENT: Councillors Barbara Blake (Chair), Rice (Vice-Chair), Bartlett, Bevan, Buxton, Cawley-Harrison, Dunstall, Ovat, Say, and White.

In attendance: Councillor Carlin (Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning).

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings, this information was noted.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Worrell.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were no deputations.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings held on 27 May 2021, 31 January 2022, and 23 May 2022 as a correct record.

7. ADOPTION OF THE NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN

The Chair introduced the item. She informed the committee that Councillor Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning, wanted to make a comment on the item, as the plan came under her portfolio.

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning said that the plan before the committee had a long genesis. It had gone through substantial amendments following extensive consultation with residents and interested groups. The plan had also been reviewed by a Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State who had judged the plans to be sound. The primary changes were the redrawn site for Pinkham Way and the need for biodiversity on the sites. The plan had recycling at its core, which was a priority for the council.

The Chair invited the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability and the Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure to introduce the report.

The Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure highlighted that the item concerned the adoption of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP), the committee were asked to recommend it to cabinet with any comments. The following was outlined from the plan:

- The NLWP was a plan that:
 - o Covered seven boroughs;
 - o Planned for waste for the next 15 years;
 - o Identifies areas for potential waste management use; and
 - o Sets out policies for waste planning applications.
- The differences between the NLWP and the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) were demarcated. The central difference being that the latter was an authority, with its own governance structures. The NLWP was not an authority, it was a badge for a joint project across seven London boroughs.
- Timescales and community engagement:
 - o 2012 original NLWP deemed unsound;
 - o February 2012 cabinet agree new NLWP;
 - o 2013-14 community engagement;
 - o July 2015 cabinet approves the plan after formal consultation;
 - o January 2019 approved by cabinet and full council;
 - o November 2019 examination hearings;
 - o Modifications in response to community input;
 - o October – December 2020 community consultation on modifications;
 - o October 2021 Planning Inspector found the plan to be legally compliant, considering it to be sound;
 - o Seven councils to adopt plan, four already have done so;
 - o The plan currently at the final stage;
- Area allocations:
 - o Pinkham Way/ Friern Barnet Sewage Works. Significant modifications had been made to this site after community consultation. The Planning Inspector had found the plan to be sound; and
 - o Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham. Both sites were designated as Strategic Industrial Locations. Therefore, they were already suitable for waste disposal.
 - o None of the above areas had been identified as suitable to contain integrated resource recovery facilities, such as an incinerator;
- The importance of the NLWP
 - o Ensure the sustainable and self-sufficient management of waste;

- An opportunity to apply environmental controls, while avoiding speculative applications
- Would support the production of the new local plan, providing a baseline for waste planning uses over the next 15 years.
- Next steps
 - 21 June 2022 to be considered, with comments from Strategic Planning Committees, by Cabinet; and
 - 18 July 2022 to be adopted by Full Council.
- Other boroughs

The following boroughs had adopted the plan:

- Barnet;
- Hackney;
- Islington; and
- Waltham Forest

Awaiting approval from:

- Camden;
- Enfield; and
- Haringey

In response to councillors questions the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability Planning and the Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure provided the following answers:

The predictions set out in the NLWP were reflecting targets set out by the Greater London Authority's *The London Plan* for waste and those set by the NLWA. Haringey Council planning were not responsible for these targets, which were fed into the plan making process. The council planning authority had responsibility for planning judgements around land allocation. The methodology for these planning judgements were set out in *National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)* which was alongside the *National Planning Policy Framework*. The Planning Inspector had scrutinised these elements in the public hearing, ensuring that the council were not planning for too much or too little waste; concluding that the land allocations based on projections were sound. It was added that the NLWP was a 15-year plan, if targets were to change then the council would have the opportunity to review these targets.

A councillor noted that he was worried by an assessment set out in the Planning Inspector report, at Appendix A, which said that 'the Plan includes objectives and policies designed to secure that waste development and use of land for such purposes within the Plan area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change'. He was worried by this assessment, as he believed it reflected a lack of ambition within the plan, due to the need to follow policy that had been set by national government. The Assistant Director relayed that where the council as planning authority could shape the direction of NLWP it would be looking to actively tackle climate change. For example, a considerable amount of the plan was centred around minimising transportation frequency.

Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham were both sites designated as Strategic Industrial Locations. Therefore, they were already suitable for waste disposal. The plan was not proposing to change these designations. The plan gave additional protection to these areas through applying additional environmental policies and

controls. There was a specific policy that steered development as far away from residential property as possible. If the plan were not adopted these safeguards would not be part of planning policy.

The area allocation for Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham was set out at Appendix D, pages 270 and 274. The Brantwood Road allocation covered the following roads:

- Brantwood Road;
- West Road; and
- Tariff Road.

The North-East Tottenham allocation covered the following roads:

- Garman Road;
- Sedge Road; and
- Lee Side Road;

Regarding Pinkham Way and the designation as SINC and proposal of public access to the current undeveloped site. The two were not mutually exclusive land uses, often it was possible to have a SINC that was compatible with public access. It was standard practice as it was thought to promote biodiversity. It was important to manage the space in the correct way to ensure compatibility. Two key pieces of evidence for Local Plan were:

- An employment land study. Which would be reported back to the committee at a future date; and
- An updated SINC study, which provided an update on biodiversity across the borough.

There were no specific plans currently about transportation via rail and water, it was referred to in the document in a general sense.

A councillor commented that in the reports pack it said that the aim of NLWP was to 'improve the health of residents and tackle deprivation' across the seven boroughs. It also stated that:

'Northumberland Park has a higher level of multiple deprivation than average, and is in the lowest 20% in the country, with the highest Universal Credit claimant count in the borough.'

Factoring in these considerations would there be opportunity for stricter measures around traffic in this area. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability said that the traffic impact on this area could be scrutinised fully at a planning stage, where the latest environmental controls would be applied. This would create enhanced controls compared to similar older sites that had not been subject to the same degree of controls. In terms of the deprivation in the area any planning application for the site would have to provide a training and skills obligation. Requirements could be set on this topic to support the local area.

A councillor commented that he was fully supportive of the plan. This was because if this plan were rejected, any waste operator could bid for land use in area in Haringey.

If the plan were accepted waste operators would be restricted to the land allocations proposed in the NLWP.

The plan had scrutinised adjacent land uses, this had been looked at by an independent Planning Inspector, and planning officers had ensured that effective safeguards are in place to minimise disruption to existing and new residential developments.

Pinkham Way allocated land had split ownership, NLWA owning the north half and London Borough of Barnet owning the southern half; no part of the allocation falls within metropolitan open land.

NLWP was dealing with policy and future planning applications. The wider issues around targets, the council's relationship with NLWA, and Veolia contracts were not part of the NLWP. These issues would be dealt with by officers concerned with waste disposal in the Environment and Neighbourhoods directorate. In relation to these issues, planning officers would be able to suggest design guidance on waste disposal and minimising disruption to residents. In terms of overall strategic planning policy, concerns around proximity to residents, designing sites to be neighbourhood friendly, and underground waste collection can be factored into the new the Local Plan.

RESOLVED

1. To note the content of this report and the Inspector's Report on the North London Waste Plan (set out in Appendix A); and
2. To agree to refer this report, attached with councillors' comments and the appended documents, to Cabinet and Full Council with the recommendation to adopt the North London Waste Plan (Appendix C) including Main Modifications (Appendix B) and associated changes to the Policies Map (Appendix D).

8. PLANNING SERVICES UPDATE - 2021-22 QUARTER 4

The Chair invited officers to introduce the item.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability highlighted that the report was split into the following areas: Development Management; Planning Policy; and Building Control. Each officer would introduce their area, taking questions at the end of each section.

The Planning Services update on Development Management was introduced by the Head of Development Management. The following was highlighted:

- Key Performance Indicators for development management remained stable; the expectation was that the service would remain in the top quartile in all categories.
- There were challenges for the service as two key staff members had left. This had caused an increase in officer case load from 50 to 73. Two new officers had been recruited.
- The Planning Authority remains in excess of government thresholds of application performance.

- In 2021-22, there had been 15 major applications, a decrease from 2020-21 where there had been 20. The average time to process these applications had decreased.
- The average time to validate an application had decreased from seven to four days.
- Pre-application meetings had increased meaning that revenue had decreased, as there were fewer larger site applications.
- Planning Performance Agreements had generated over double the amount of revenue than in the previous year.
- Revenue had also increased through the introduction of new services such as express householder written advice and a fast-track certificate of lawfulness services.
- Two recent appeal losses for 2019-21 had taken the Planning Authority over the designation threshold. These two appeals were 300-306 West Green Road and Guildens, Courtenay Avenue. The former was refused by the Planning Sub-Committee with a recommendation for approval. The latter was allowed following a legal challenge to the original inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal in May 2021. There is one further appeal pending regarding the refusal of the THFC Goods Yard application. The decision would fall within the 2020-22 period.
- The time taken to register enforcement complaints has increased due to staff shortages in the customer services team; this was slowly changing as department had recently recruited staff.
- Officers secured a confiscation order of just over £100,000 against a landlord who had deliberately refused to comply with the requirements of two enforcement notices at two of his properties.

In response to councillor questions, the following answers were provided:

- Over the lockdown period the service had received a record amount of planning applications. This created an overload that was augmented through some staff departures. The overload of applications was now decreasing, particularly through generating high levels of income which meant that the team would be well resourced.
- Complaints were to be acknowledged within a day, a visit made within 21 days, and a decision should be made within eight weeks. This month the performance of meeting these targets was at 100%.
- On applications at a certain threshold the mayor becomes involved in the stage one process. The mayor can also call in a decision at the stage two process. The threshold at which the mayor operates was any building over thirty metres high and contained over 150 residential units, there were other thresholds for commercial buildings, metropolitan open land, and waste.
- The reason for optimism around case load and achieving targets for dealing with complaints in a timely manner was that a new IT system was being introduced. This would modernise processes through automation, which lessen workload on officers.
- The new system would allow the monitoring of enforcement to become more visible through various methods of automatic updates.

Planning Policy was introduced by the Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure. The following was highlighted:

- Update on timescales for the council's emerging local plan:

- The plan was created through resident consultation.
- After collating responses, a draft Local Plan would be created.
- This draft Local Plan would then go out to resident consultation by the end of the year.
- The aim was to submit a new Local Plan, ready for adoption, by 2023
- Update on the evidence base on the Local Plan:
 - The majority of the key pieces of evidence for the new Local Plan had been completed.
 - A key piece of work underpinning the Local Plan was a characterisation study which officers were doing inhouse. This would be presented to the New Local Plan Member Working Group; this group comprises of members of the Strategic Planning Committee.
- The new Local Plan would look to reflect the council's strategic ambitions, containing:
 - Sustainability;
 - Health and wellbeing;
 - Equalities; and
 - They would be looking at areas such as housing to achieve the above ambitions.
- Update on the Planning and Policy workstreams:
 - NLWP;
 - The Revised Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule;
 - Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill.

In response to councillor questions the following answers were provided:

- The service did note the mutability in government policy. It was felt that certain government policies would be implemented, others would be watered down, and others would be removed. The service was mindful on expending excessive amounts of resources in responding and planning for government policy.
- The percentage of the budget that was funded through fees was over 50%.
- Where consultation was required on specific parts of proposed government planning legislation, the committee's views would be sought.

Building Control was introduced by the Head of Building Control Services. The following was highlighted:

- There was a strong recovery after the pandemic, due to an increase in applications.
- The service was having to deal with work that had reverted to them from private building control companies.
- 225 dangerous structures had been identified this year.
- Today was the fifth year of Grenfell. Out of that came the Hackett Report. Out of that came the Building Safety Bill, which the Building Safety Act was created. Due to this there were considerable changes going forward. One of which was that it was no longer an option for developers to choose a building controls provider.
- The service was doing well working from home. They had taken on one apprentice and were looking at taking on a second.
- Due to legislation the service would have to be registered along with each employee. Due to the service being registered, it would mean it would need to be regularly audited.

- Building controls had been asked by the Commonwealth Games to be the independent chair for SAG meetings for the forthcoming games in Birmingham.

In response to councillors questions the following answers were provided:

- Contracts undertaken by private building control companies would revert to the council when these companies could no longer carry out the works they had been contracted to do. There had been an increase in these instances due to issues around insurance arising from Grenfell. When the council took on this type of work, they received a fee. However, this fee was not representative of the work that was required.
- Due to local government legislation councils were not intended to be profitable, they were only allowed to recover the costs of providing services. Based on annual calculation, the income from charges for a service should not exceed the cost of providing them.
- The service was undertaking out-of-borough works, particularly in Barnet and Enfield.

RESOLVED

To consider note a report on the work of the Planning Service for Quarter 4.

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

10. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To note the dates of future meetings:

Thursday, 20 October 2022

Monday, 20 February 2023

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date