

MINUTES OF MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Monday, 6th March, 2023, 7.00 - 9.20 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Nicola Bartlett, John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, Lester Buxton, Luke Cawley-Harrison, George Dunstall, Ajda Ovat, Matt White and Alexandra Worrell

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

There were no apologies for absence. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Cathy Brennan.

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 November 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/2022/3858 - WAT TYLER HOUSE, BOYTON ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON, N8 7AU

The Committee considered the application for the redevelopment of the car park adjacent to Wat Tyler House to provide 15 new Council rent homes in a part 4, 5 and

7 storey building. Provision of associated amenity space, cycle and refuse/recycling stores, a wheelchair parking space on Boyton Road and enhancement of existing communal areas and play space to the rear on the Campsbourne Estate.

James Mead, Planning Officer, introduced the report. In response to the points raised by councillors, the following responses were provided:

- The Planning Officer stated that the car club and Travel Plan would be secured through the planning obligations.
- In response to a question about transportation, the Transport Planning Team Manager explained that the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) assumed that services were only relevant within 640 metres, even though many people would travel further to access bus and rail services. It was noted that officers were working with Transport for London (TfL) to increase the PTAL of the site but that this was very challenging without substantial funding. It was explained that there were plans to increase connectivity as part of the proposal, including improvements for cycling and walking.
- In relation to a question about kitchen provision, it was clarified that the proposal included a combination of units with separate kitchens or with larger kitchen and dining or living areas.
- It was noted that the water use reduction target would be enforced and monitored through Building Regulations.
- In response to a query about the impact of satellite dishes, the Head of Development Management noted that the standard condition relating to satellite dishes should be included to ensure that they did not have an unacceptable impact.
- It was noted that the proposal was a smaller development which was not required to meet the target to provide 10% of dwellings for wheelchair users. The applicant team clarified that, overall, the Council's Housing Delivery Programme would provide more than 10% of dwellings for wheelchair users.
- Some members enquired how the proposal would provide dual aspect without overshadowing neighbouring properties. The Principal Urban Design Officer explained that the design involved three cubes which were slightly offset and aligned with neighbouring buildings; this was able to provide dual or triple aspect without overshadowing neighbouring properties.
- In response to a query about parking, the Transport Planning Team Manager noted that the site would not be car free but that council tenants would now have on street, rather than off street, parking. It was commented that extensive parking surveys had demonstrated that there was capacity for on street parking.
- It was noted that the report commented on bay windows on the northern elevation of Tennyson House and found that, as these did not appear to be primary openings, the proposal would have no material impact on living conditions. The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the uses of these rooms were not known but that, as the windows were less than two metres from the corner of building, it was very likely that there would be a second window for the room; it was commented that a window near the corner of the building would still have some outlook even if a building was located immediately beside it.
- In relation to a query about parking restrictions in the area, it was confirmed that consultation for a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was ongoing but that there was currently no CPZ in the area. It was noted that the scheme did not propose car

capping or car restrictions and so residents of the development could apply for a permit in any future parking scheme.

- Some members noted that the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) had raised concerns relating to fire safety and it was enquired whether this had been resolved. The Planning Officer explained that the HSE had commented on the ancillary accommodation and had expressed concerns about the cycle stores opening into the lobby. It was explained that the ground floor units had separate exits and that the upper floors had an escape door to the side of the staircase which meant that they would not have to exit through the lobby. The Head of Development Management highlighted that another fire door had been added to separate the ancillary accommodation from the fire escape and that, with the additional separation and means of escape, officers were satisfied that the measures were sufficient. It was added that the scheme would also have to satisfy the Building Regulations and that Building Control had indicated that they had no anticipated objections. It was noted that the cycle store could be accessed externally but explained that this was considered to compromise the usage of the cycle store.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was stated that the green roofs were intended to be self-sustaining with some elements of biannual maintenance and that safe access for this was included as part of the building control measures for the scheme.
- The applicant team commented that service charges for residents were set at a particular level across the borough and that there would be no variation in the charges for individual residents.
- Some members acknowledged the asymmetrical design of the proposal but queried the decision to have two colours and felt that this was more visually intrusive. The applicant believed that the differentiation of materials provided some variation which reduced the visual impact and noted that the proposal had been developed alongside extensive conversations with Planning Officers. It was also commented that the materials would be subject to condition and the applicant would continue to consider the exact colour of materials.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum, and including an additional condition controlling the use of satellite dishes to ensure that they did not have an unacceptable impact.

Following a vote with 10 votes in favour, 0 votes against, and 0 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 an agreement providing for the measures 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 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 agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 30th March 2023 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in 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.

Conditions

- 1) Three Year Time Limit
- 2) Approved Plans
- 3) Use Class & Tenure
- 4) Materials
- 5) Obscured Glazing
- 6) Air Source Heat Pump
- 7) Accessibility, Adaptability & Wheelchair Accessibility
- 8) Landscaping Proposals
- 9) Arboricultural Report
- 10) Biodiversity
- 11) Living Roof
- 12) Reinstatement of Crossover and Provision of Parking Bay
- 13) Cycle Storage Details
- 14) Construction Management Plan
- 15) Construction Environment Management Plan
- 16) Secured by Design Accreditation
- 17) Secured by Design Certification
- 18) CCTV Locations
- 19) External Lighting
- 20) Fire Statement
- 21) Sustainable Drainage
- 22) Management of Drainage Scheme
- 23) Piling Method Statement
- 24) Contamination
- 25) Unexpected Contamination
- 26) Non-Road Mobile Machinery
- 27) Energy Plan
- 28) Sustainability Review
- 29) Occupant Energy Use
- 30) Be Seen
- 31) Overheating
- 32) Water Efficiency
- 33) Residents Satisfaction Survey
- 34) Satellite dishes**

Informatives

- 1) CIL Liable
- 2) Land Ownership
- 3) Party Wall Act
- 4) Hours of Construction Work
- 5) Numbering
- 6) Designing Out Crime Officer
- 7) London Fire Brigade (Building Regulations)
- 8) London Fire Brigade (Signage)
- 9) Thames Water (Groundwater Risk Management Permit)
- 10) Thames Water (Water Pressure)
- 11) Thames Water (Underground Water Assets)

Planning Obligations

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.

Heads of Terms

- 1) Affordable Homes for Rent;
- 2) Local Employment;
- 3) Employment & Skills Plan;
- 4) Carbon Offset Contribution (based on £2,850 per tonne of carbon emissions);
- 5) Car Club and Membership Subsidies;
- 6) Travel Plan;
- 7) Travel Plan Monitoring;
- 8) Off-Site Highways & Landscaping Works; and
- 9) Obligations Monitoring Costs;

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

9. The Council at this present time is unable to fully evidence its five-year supply of housing land. Therefore, the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF should be treated as a material consideration when determining this application, which for decision-taking means granting permission unless: (i) the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. Nevertheless, decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan (relevant policies summarised in this report) unless material considerations indicate otherwise (of which the NPPF is a significant material consideration).

9. HGY/2021/1909 - CROSS HOUSE, 7 CROSS LANE, N8 7SA

The Committee considered the application for the demolition of existing building; redevelopment to provide business (Class E(g)(iii)) use at the ground, first and second floors, residential (Class C3) use on the upper floors, within a building of six storeys plus basement, provision of 7 car parking spaces and refuse storage.

At 8pm, Cllr Brennan arrived but, as the item had already begun, she joined the public gallery and did not participate in the discussion or voting for this item.

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

- The Planning Officer confirmed that, as set out in the addendum, the majority of the units were dual aspect and the units that were single aspect were either east or west facing. It was noted that no single aspect units were north facing.
- It was noted that Council Policy DM13 stated that sites with the capacity to deliver more than 10 dwellings would need to provide affordable housing and some members suggested that the site could have this capacity. The Head of Development Management noted that the site did appear to have capacity but highlighted that the site allocation and employment policies were also considerations. It was noted that the scheme would re-provide the existing employment space and that, on balance, officers considered that the proposal was acceptable. It was noted that, if a tenth unit was provided, it was unlikely that it would be viable to provide affordable housing on the site and it was likely that there would be a payment in lieu to provide affordable housing elsewhere.
- The Chair noted that large commercial units and workspaces were needed in the borough. It was stated that additional residential provision would reduce the amount of commercial space and that it was necessary to consider the balance of these two uses. The Planning Officer commented that the existing tenants of the site intended to occupy the new development.
- Some members noted that there was a section 106 obligation which would secure affordable housing if the employment space was converted to residential. Concerns were expressed that this only applied to the commercial space and did not cover a situation where any residential units were divided and the overall provision exceeded 10 dwellings. The Head of Development Management agreed

that this wording resulted in unintended ambiguity and that the obligation should arise where there were more than 10 dwellings; it was suggested that this wording be clarified for the avoidance of doubt.

- Some members expressed concerns about the quality of the application in terms of the presence of single aspect units, the fact that density had not been maximised, the low light levels in the commercial space, and the lack of play space or green space. The Principal Urban Design Officer explained that the scheme was not large enough to meet the threshold that required play space but would still provide private, external amenity space for residents and was located near to parks. It was noted that it was important for commercial units to be retained and the development was considered to be well rounded and high quality overall. The Principal Urban Design Officer believed that the units would have good aspect overall as there would only be three flats per floor and the kitchen windows would provide some additional light through use of a lightwell. It was noted that all of the units would have external balconies and it was considered that there would be good levels of daylight and sunlight as well as good living conditions.
- In response to a query about whether the proposal could have been taller, the Principal Urban Design Officer commented that there were a number of locally listed buildings in the area and it was considered appropriate that the scheme would match the heights of neighbouring developments. It was noted that the applicant had restricted the building to six storeys and had demonstrated that the proposal would not appear in any key, local views.
- In relation to family units, the Planning Officer confirmed that two family units were proposed and both would be 3-bed units. It was clarified that the family units would have dual aspect.

Karen Holtge spoke in objection to the application. She stated that she lived opposite the site in Smithfield Square and was concerned about issues of overlooking. It was commented that there was some space above the existing building but that the proposed building would have six storeys and would have an increased impact on daylight and sunlight for residential properties and the street level. Concerns were expressed that the proposal would result in a sense of enclosure and it was asked whether the building could be set back slightly to reduce the impact; it was suggested that this could create a more interesting side road rather than a dark and windy side street. It was stated that the Juliet balconies were missing on the second floor from some of the windows but that, if these were to go all the way across, there might be some more privacy.

It was stated that there was a successful recording studio on site where operations often ceased at 2am; it was stated that this had resulted in some noise issues from people leaving the premises and talking on the external stairs area and so the removal of this element was welcomed. However, concerns were expressed that the external terrace and car park would result in noise issues which would be directly opposite a number of bedrooms in Smithfield Square. It was commented that the proposal to plant trees was welcomed and it was suggested that additional planting could be undertaken if the building was set back further. Alternatively, if it was not possible to set the building back, it was suggested that moving the parapet up higher could help to reduce noise issues.

Members of the applicant team addressed the Committee. Paul Osborne, Agent and Architect (GML Architects), stated that the key features of the application had been covered by the Planning Officer. It was noted that the Design and Access Statement set out the aspect of all units and the applicant team considered that all units were dual aspect; even if a second window was small, it was stated that it would provide some cross ventilation. In relation to the height and massing of the proposal, the applicant team noted that there was a clearly defined building line which was set by other, surrounding planning applications. It was commented that the proposal would be three metres set back compared to the existing building and would provide additional trees and landscaping which would be a tangible improvement to the street scene.

It was noted that the proposal would logically follow the line of the streetscape. It was explained that the building line was a slightly different height on either side and the proposal would transition between the two sides. In relation to amenity space, it was commented that the site was quite restricted but that there were local green spaces in the area that could be used by residents. In relation to the quantity of commercial floor space, it was noted that there was demand for this and the existing commercial tenant was expected to continue operations within the new building. It was added that the site allocation identified the site for employment-led development.

The applicant team responded to questions from the Committee:

- In response to a query about affordable housing, the applicant team stated that the Council's policy requirement to provide affordable housing applied to developments with 10 or more units; as the proposal was for nine units, the threshold had not been reached within this application. It was explained that the employment space proposed would re-provide the existing amount on the site and that some additional residential units would be introduced.
- Some members enquired how the applicant team proposed to address noise concerns, particularly on the external terrace. The applicant team suggested that it would be possible to include a restriction on the hours of use for the commercial unit in relation to the terrace. It was commented that noise issues in the area would also impact the residential units in the scheme and the applicant would want to avoid this.
- In relation to further queries about the impact on residents, the applicant team commented that a condition on hours of use for the terrace would be beneficial for all parties. Members felt that it would be appropriate to condition the external amenity space on the commercial units so that it could not be used after 10pm or 11pm, whatever time was standard in the circumstances. The Head of Development Management noted that it was considered acceptable to include a condition relating to limiting hours.
- In relation to a query about overlooking, the applicant team stated that overlooking was an inevitable result on the site, even if the building was moved slightly.
- If the existing tenants did not use the building, the applicant team explained that the site could have Class E(g)(iii) light industrial use, such as a fashion studio, which was designed to be compatible with the surrounding residential area. It was added that some potential layouts were included in the addendum.
- It was confirmed that the change to the recommendation in the addendum related to the section 106 completion date; this had originally been stated as 06/03/2023 but should have been stated as 06/05/2023.

- Some members noted that concerns had been raised about noise, particularly during the night, and it was enquired what provisions could be put in place to mitigate the impact on residents. The applicant team noted that it was possible to condition the employment hours for the light industrial use but that it would not be possible to control any noise emanating from residential units through planning conditions. The Head of Development Management commented that noise could be considered as part of a management plan.

It was confirmed that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum, and with the following amendments:

- To amend the obligations so that affordable housing contributions would be required if 10 or more dwellings were provided in any circumstances, rather than just where the commercial unit was converted into a dwelling(s).
- To include an additional condition to require that the external terrace for the commercial space was not used after 10pm in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties and to ensure clarity.
- To include a Condition to require a Noise Management Plan in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.

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

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve 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 an agreement providing for the measures 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 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 agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than **06/05/2023** within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in 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.

Summary Lists of Conditions, Informatives and Heads of Terms

Conditions

- 1) Three years
- 2) Drawings
- 3) Materials
- 4) Boundary treatment and access control
- 5) Landscaping
- 6) Lighting
- 7) Site levels
- 8) Secure by design accreditation (residential)
- 9) Secure by design certification
- 10) Secure by design accreditation (commercial)
- 11) Land Contamination
- 12) Unexpected Contamination
- 13) NRMM
- 14) Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
- 15) Public highway condition survey
- 16) Cycle parking
- 17) Delivery and Servicing Plan
- 18) Car Parking Design and Management Plan
- 19) Land Affected by Contamination
- 20) Verification report
- 21) Long Term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan for Groundwater
- 22) Unidentified Contamination
- 23) Borehole Management
- 24) Piling/Foundation works Risk Assessment with Respect to Groundwater Resources
- 25) Infiltration of Surface Water onto the Ground
- 26) Satellite antenna
- 27) Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
- 28) Piling Method Statement
- 29) Architect retention
- 30) Energy strategy
- 31) Be Seen
- 32) Overheating (Residential)
- 33) Overheating (Non-Residential)
- 34) Living roofs
- 35) Biodiversity
- 36) BREEAM Certificate
- 37) Method of monitoring adjacent properties for potential movement during the build
- 38) Construction Management plan
- 39) Wheelchair accessible dwellings
- 40) Restriction to use class
- 41) Basement Impact Assessment
- 42) Sound insulation
- 43) Limit on hours of use for the external terrace**
- 44) Noise Management Plan**

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation

- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Water pressure
- 8) Asbestos
- 9) Secure by design
- 10) Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

1. Affordable housing payment where 10 or **more** units are provided by future change of use.
2. Section 278 Highway Agreement
 - The additional highway works necessary to accommodate the proposed Cross House development (including the proposed access to the basement car park, as well as relining and resigning works)
3. Sustainable Transport Initiatives
 - Monitoring of commercial travel plan contribution of £3,000
 - £4,000 towards amendment of the local Traffic Management Order (also covering the cost of amending any existing yellow line restrictions, see further details under S.278 highway works agreement)
 - Car Club - a credit of £50 per annum for a period of two years and an enhanced car club membership for the residents of the family-sized units (3+ bedrooms) including 3 years' free membership and £100 (one hundred pounds in credit) per year for the first 3 years
 - £6000 towards CPZ contributions to the extension of existing Controlled Parking Zones
4. Carbon Mitigation
 - Be Seen commitment to uploading energy data
 - Energy Plan and Sustainability Review
 - Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £36,480 plus a 10% management fee
5. Employment Initiative – participation and financial contribution towards Local Training and Employment Plan
 - Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator;
 - Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies;
 - 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents;
 - 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees;
 - Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of

- total staff);
- Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs.

6. Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value of contributions (not including monitoring);
 - £500 per non-financial contribution;
 - Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000
5. In the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (1) above not being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (3) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing the provision of financial contributions towards off-site affordable housing in the event that **10 or more dwellings were provided in any circumstances the commercial unit(s) is converted in to a dwelling(s)**, the proposals would fail to secure affordable housing and meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies H4 and H5, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM 11 and DM 13.
 2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) Section 278 Highway Agreement for the additional highway works necessary to accommodate the proposed Cross House development (including the proposed access to the basement car park, as well as relining and resigning works 2) A contribution towards CPZ contributions to the extension of existing Controlled Parking Zones 3) A contribution towards Monitoring of commercial travel plan 4) A contribution towards amendment of the local Traffic Management Order (also covering the cost of amending any existing yellow line restrictions, see further details under S.278 highway works agreement 5) Two years free car club membership and £50 driving credit and enhanced car club membership and £100 (one hundred pounds in credit) per year for the first 3 years would fail to adequately mitigate highways and transport impacts As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies T1, Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM48
 3. 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.
 4. 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.

6. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (5) 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.

Cllr Brennan did not vote on this item.

10. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

Cllr Brennan joined the Committee at 9.15pm.

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

11. PPA/2021/0003 - CIVIC CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, LONDON, N22 8ZW

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the refurbishment of existing Civic Centre and redevelopment of the existing rear car park for the erection of a three storey building (plus roof enclosure); 2 x two storey links; creation of central courtyard; and associated landscaping.

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

- It was commented that accessibility and transparency were central to the original design of the building and members welcomed the fact that the proposals would maintain these features.
- It was enquired whether the building would be open to passers-by. The applicant team noted that areas of external landscaping and the reception area would be publicly accessible; there would also be an area that could be hired and used for events. Some members noted the importance of ensuring that some areas of the building were secure but felt that the Civic Centre should be more inclusive and should have more opportunities for the public to engage. The applicant team noted that the reception and some outdoor areas would be open to the public and could have flexible uses.
- Some members believed that the car park would be reasonably prominent and it was enquired whether this could be moved from the front of the building to somewhere less visible. The applicant team noted that the plan may be misleading as it was intended to have a pedestrianised area at the front of the building. It was explained that cars would access the area from Trinity Road and it was highlighted that disabled parking was required to be located within a maximum distance from

the main entrance. It was stated that the area outside the main entrance would be pedestrianised and would be significantly upgraded.

- In response to a query, the applicant team confirmed that the net internal area of the building was 6,000 sqm and the external area was 11,000 sqm.
- Some members noted that, in the past, the west side of the building had experienced overheating issues during the afternoon and evening. The applicant team explained that the glazing would be significantly upgraded and that the building would have mechanical ventilation.
- In response to a query, the applicant team confirmed that there were a number of memorial elements across the site, including some planting; members urged the applicant to retain or relocate these elements. It was noted that there would be engagement with the member forum and it was suggested that the reception area would be a suitable opportunity to capture some memorial elements.
- In relation to parking, it was explained that there would be eight parking spaces: three of these were disabled parking spaces and the other five would be enlarged spaces for flexible uses. It was acknowledged that some staff required vehicle access for their roles; the services with fleet vehicles would not be based at the Civic Centre and it was noted that the essential car permit policy was due to be reviewed for other staff. Some members noted that parking was important for visitors and for older people who may not be able to use the underground. The applicant team commented that the site was well-served by public transport and noted that event organisers could consider access and transportation measures, such as minibus provision. It was acknowledged that there would always be tension between parking and environmental elements. Some members commented that they did not believe that the parking provision was sufficient and that it should be reconsidered. The applicant team noted this point and stated that they would continue to work to balance these interests.
- The applicant team confirmed that the meeting rooms would have modern audio visual and presentation equipment. It was noted that, due to the heritage status of the building, the equipment would likely be sensitively designed and installed.
- In relation to refreshment facilities, it was explained that staff areas would have kitchenettes on every floor. There would also be large kitchen provision on the ground floor, including a servery counter which could be used by a caterer.
- Some members highlighted that, previously, users of the building had been required to use window blinds frequently due to sun and heat issues; it was requested that this issue be considered. It was commented that mechanical ventilation had been used but had not been effective.
- Some members noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had commented that the east to west pedestrian and cycle route might not be well-used and it was enquired whether any changes would be made. The applicant team stated that some changes had been made and that provision had been made to improve the pedestrian route at the southern end of the building. The connection of the path to the woodland garden would also be improved and there would be a clear path through to Bounds Green Road.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

In relation to a query about the progress of Hornsey Police Station (HGY/2022/2116), the Head of Development Management noted that some transport issues were being resolved and that the viability report was being assessed; all relevant matters were being considered before the recommendation was finalised.

It was noted that the Omega Works application was currently classified as invalid. It was explained that this meant that there were insufficient plans; this had been communicated to the applicant and it was expected that the outstanding information would be submitted.

Some concerns were expressed that Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court and Osbourne Grove had been in progress for a significant time period. In relation to Osbourne Grove, the Head of Development Management believed that some amendments were awaited and, once submitted, these would be reviewed. In relation to Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court, it was noted that the Housing Team was considering the detail of the proposals before progressing with further pre-application discussions and with the application.

In relation to the Lockkeeper's Cottages (HGY/2020/0847), it was confirmed that planning permission had been granted and would be valid as long as development commenced within three years.

The Chair noted that any further 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 new items of urgent business.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 24 April 2023.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date