

7:00-9:13

PRESENT:

Councillors: Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, Sue Jameson, Emine Ibrahim, Pippa Connor, George Dunstall and Lotte Collett

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 were received from Councillor Emery and Councillor Worrell. Councillor Connor would be his substitute. This was in accordance with Committee standing orders 53 to 56.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Ibrahim stated a declaration of interest regarding item 8, she was a councillor for the Noel Park Ward. She would be viewing the item with an open mind.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 11th December as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2023/2357 LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS, BETWEEN HORNSEY PARK ROAD, MAYES ROAD, COBURG ROAD, WESTERN ROAD AND THE KINGS CROSS / EAST COAST MAINLINE, CLARENDON GAS WORKS, OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE, AND 57-89 WESTERN ROAD N8 & N22 (PAGES 19 - 126)

Planning Officer, Valerie Okeiyi introduced the report for approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, access, pertaining to Buildings H1, H2 and H3, forming Phase 4, including the construction of residential units (Use Class C3), commercial floorspace, basement, and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning permission HGY/2017/3117 dated 19th April 2018. Robbie McNaugher noted to members that a further late objection was received from Park Malvern Residents Association. This objection was based on lack of engagement and the thresholds of the parameters being

exceeded; the residence group believe they should have been notified on this. Officer's response to this was addressed in the addendum, there had been a public consultation and letters were sent out directly to residents. There were also meetings with the resident's association in October. In terms of the parameter plans being exceeded, that was noted to be amended through a non-material amendment.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- The wall on the 14th floor terrace is 1.5m, which is higher than building regulations standard of 1.1m. Officers were confident that this wall wasn't climbable. There would be an enclosure feel, the terrace would also provide wind protection whilst still providing potential for views further out. It was noted that there would be an amendment to condition 2 to include words on safety measures.
- There was a 21-day consultation period given to reserved matters applications, the consultation for this application ended in October. There were regular liaisons with resident groups and pre/post application engagement events – this went beyond what is often seen. The scope of this was limited due to the application being an application for reserved matters. The exhibition detailed proposals for phase 4, residents could feed back on the proposal and put forward names of businesses for the new public square space.
- There had been ongoing wind mitigation disputes about inputs, should an agreement not be reached, this could be controlled by conditions and further mitigations of landscaping. There would be scope to change this within the landscaping conditions. There was a meeting on Friday with council officers but there were delays in setting this up. Officers were approached in October regarding this, but it took a while to receive a response back and then there was the Christmas break. The applicant had still presented the scheme to residents at their October meeting.
- There is a slight change to the number of car parking spaces provided. This development would be car free/car capped. The applicant could provide parking, but residents would not be able to apply for on-street parking. Most of the spaces available would be for wheelchair accessible units, which complies with the London plan. Residents who moved in would not be able to apply for parking permits on the local roads.
- There is communal amenity space on the 10th floor of H1 which is a standalone building. There would be communal amenity space for blocks h2/h3 and a communal podium terrace between h2/h3. In terms of green space, within the master plan of scale there had been spaces put aside for this, such as Hornsey Park Road. In terms of links to Wood Green common, this square would provide a link for residents to be able to access; there would be further work to improve and enhance that. The applicant had paid to improve the tunnel access to Alexandra Palace.
- The development fitted in with the wider area, wider work was being led by the regeneration service of the Council. There was a need to improve open space and there had been engagement over the last summer. Through the Council Capital and Community Infrastructure Levy, three school streets would be funded, there would be improvements made to Mayese Road, Caxton Gardens and Wood Green Common specifically. Part of this would be funded by the development, so this wider development and this phase have and will pay community infrastructure levy. Some of the money which had already been collected from the scheme and elsewhere in the local area was already being used for these projects specifically to improve links and access.

- It was common for developments of this nature to have a one way system, within that one way system there would be loading bays and this would be a managed service.
- The Haringey CIL was predicted to be around £8,000,000; this would be going into part of the capital project.
- The Cultural Strategy ensured spaces provided could accommodate uses, such as for the Brewery or College Arts. Discussions around this were occurring with College Arts.
- Within phase 2 the homes provided would be shared ownership, phase 3 which was one of the recent reserved matters approvals there would be social rent and the Council could acquire this. Within phase 1 would be social rented homes. A lot of the affordable housing had already been delivered, there was a 32% affordable housing provision. This was now at 47%, thus had exceeded the target. Overall, the entire master plan would hit that target and there was now a Council block that would also be included.
- One of the main points about the Square was that it had to be flexible. This Square would host events, markets, and performances - for that reason it wouldn't be appropriate for this to be a further green space.

The following was noted in response to questions from the applicant team:

- In terms of the consultation, 20,000 leaflets were posted to the local community. At the public consultation, the resident's association said this information was also posted onto their WhatsApp group. In October, there was a walk of the site and a presentation delivered. The applicant had worked with the Council and within parameter plans and master plans. They had also worked closely with the architects and taken on board comments.
- The public square would have hard landscaping as this would be suitable for the purpose; markets/performances. Hornsey Park would be a 2-minute walk away if a green space was desired for residents.
- Officers could not condition a financial contribution. The CIL would cover the NHS contribution.
- Following the QRP, all issues which had been addressed were resolved. One issue raised was the scheme layout and the proximities of block h1-h2. Block h1 was then situated further to the west. The use of stone rather than brick would prevent damage from graffiti. The number of trees had increased, the design team were happy with the changes made since the panel and were satisfied all concerns have been addressed. The three floors had been made more prominent and distinctive to the lower floors than they were previously, this was to give them a greater distinction as tall buildings in their longer and medium views.
- There had been several phases on wind studies for the scheme. There had been wind tunnel testing, in line with the outline consent. Favourable aspects were shown in the initial computer modelling, more work was done in developing landscaping to mitigate. It was not just the height but also the orientation and the exposure. There was a lot of factors that went into how windy conditions end up around the base of the buildings.
- In terms of fire safety, there would be sprinklers in the development.

Cllr Bevan put forward a motion to amend the NHS contribution, this was not seconded so this motion was not carried.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement

Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. It was noted there would be an amendment to condition 2 to include safety. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted following a vote with 10 for, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives.

Conditions – Summary (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Section 12 of this report)

- 1) In accordance with plans
- 2) Landscaping
- 3) Boundary treatment
- 4) Design details

Informatives – Summary (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Section 12 of this report)

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers

9. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The following items are pre-application presentations to the Planning Sub Committee and discussion of proposals. Notwithstanding that this is a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no decision will be taken on the following items and any subsequent applications will be the subject of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with standard procedures.

10. PPA/2024/0002 157-159 HORNSEY PARK ROAD, N8 0JX (PAGES 127 - 150)

Planning Officer, Valerie Okeyi proposed the report for redevelopment of the site to provide 32 residential units and commercial floorspace with associated disabled parking, landscaping and access.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- In terms of the commercial space, it would sit within the site allocation for mixed use and there was a quantum of commercial space to be provided across the whole area. At the QRP they felt that it would be preferable as a residential led scheme. There were merits in that as it was a small site which sat behind other residential units. However, there was a desire for a link through the scheme and the planners felt that there was an ability to tie in commercial activities. The size of the commercial unit being 1.1 square meters would be suitable for a smaller business.

- The 2017 site allocation document had largely come to fruition in terms of planning permissions. The demand for workspace was high and there was not anything in terms of material planning considerations that would necessarily steer officers away from that.
- Site access would only be from Hornsey Park Rd, but there would be a construction management plan that would be put forward with the application to detail how the works would be managed. The applicant had dealt with sites with tighter access than this. It would equally come down to the sizes of the vehicles and also the method of construction used; those things could be mitigated. Surveys could also be carried out for residents.
- All of the flats would have kitchens. There would only be dual aspects within the scheme. The applicant had worked to mediate between houses on Hornsey Park Road therefore did not believe these homes would look out of place. The shared ownership would be roughly 55% of private sale value. A 2-bedroom flat would estimate around £300,000.
- The applicant had not looked at opening the Moselle and turning it into an open river. This would create issues with adjoining properties if opened and then closed. This could create a weak spot; the boundary of the site ran down the middle of the Moselle therefore this would have to be in conjunction with the other adjoining landowners.
- Initially, affordable housing was going to be situated within block B. Currently, the scheme was showing 6%-14% affordable offering. It had proven difficult to put social housing in with private housing as housing associations preferred not to mix due to their own costs. The applicant was in the early viability stage and was reviewing with the external consultant; this would be an opportunity to look at the committed sum. The team hadn't yet discussed the community space but were predominantly looking at class E use.
- The site would be adjacent to the Clarendon site but also next to the other houses, the applicant was looking to create a transition between the two. There had been extensive discussions with the QRP and chairs review and following on from that changes have been made to the design.
- Following on from the recent viability studies, there would be potential for a maximum of 4 affordable units provided and minimum of 2. Once the applicant had confirmed the number of units and the Council agreed, there could then be further discussions around a Council offering.
- Class E commercial space could be shops, restaurants, cafes, offices, nurseries, creches or a small health centre. Due to the location of the site and size there was not an expectation of a large business expressing interest; however, the applicant would be open to flexibility.

11. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 151 - 166)

To advise of major proposals in the pipeline including those awaiting the issue of the decision notice following a committee resolution and subsequent signature of the section 106 agreement; applications submitted and awaiting determination; and proposals being discussed at the pre-application stage.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- Cllr Bevan noted the planning application for Shell Petrol Station at the end of Park Lane and requested an update, this would be taken away and looked into.

- It was explained that the Civic Centre application was at a legal letter stage which would set out provisions.
- Grove Lawn Tennis club has had a number of extensions to the deadline while issues were being worked through.

12. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 167 - 190)

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period 27/11/2023 – 29/12/2023.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 14.** To note the date of the next meeting as 5th February.