

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 Cllr Worrell, Cllr Ibrahim and Cllr Collett.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 7th November.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2024/0466 157-159, HORNSEY PARK ROAD, LONDON, N8 0JX

Valerie Okeiyi, planning officer, introduced the report for demolition of existing structures and erection of two buildings to provide residential units and Class E floorspace; and provision of associated landscaping, a new pedestrian route, car and cycle parking, and refuse and recycling facilities.

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

- Normally officers would conduct an early-stage viability review during the construction process and review the viability. The late-stage review would usually take place towards the end of the development of the proposal; officers would try to capture any uplift in value. The applicant had taken the commercial decision to increase the payment in lieu to avoid a further late stage review, there would only be one review mechanism in this proposal.
- All residents within the building would have the same individual access points in the development. They would also have access to all of the communal spaces, such as a dedicated play space and communal amenity space.
- The applicant proposed that the boundary fence would be 2.1 metres high with a 300-millimetre light rail above to prevent climbing. There would also be a boundary treatment and secure by design condition.
- The applicant provided evidence to show that registered providers were not willing to take on 6 shared ownership units. The Council also confirmed that

they did not wish to acquire the shared ownership units. Officers could consider exceptional circumstances which would allow the Council to consider an alternative and, in this instance, it would be a payment in lieu which was supported by policy.

- The reason for requesting against a late-stage review was due to the challenges to get financing for developments. Having any of those additional requirements on the proposal could affect the ability to get funding effectively.
- The £600,000 payment would most likely go to the housing delivery team, and they would be able to feed that into their own developments. The funding would usually be used where there was not grant funding available from the GLA or the government.
- Market evidence submitted demonstrated that an office was most likely the more appropriate option on the site.

Marcus Ballard represented Parkside Malvern Residents Association. He attended the committee and spoke in objection of the proposal, a summary of his speech is below:

In his view there was unsafe and insufficient site access orientated away from SA21 Clarendon Gateway, the 'central' metropolitan area and Western Heartlands and a failure to respect the Blue Ribbon and integrate the Moselle Brook into the development and SA21.

John Miles, resident of Hornsey Park Road attended the committee and spoke in objection of the proposal, a summary of his speech is below:

He raised concerns around the limitations to residents' view, he noted that they already had limited views due to the shopping mall. In his view there was not a sensible case for 4 and 6 storey dwellings behind the back gardens of neighbours and the impact on biodiversity would be slight.

The following was noted in response to questions to the objectors:

- It was noted that the 'blue ribbon' Moselle Brook extended within and beyond the red line boundary of this site.
- The construction management plan would be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement.
- There was existing access onto Hornsey Park Road from the development site, it would be almost impossible to say this development proposal would have to be constructed from Brook Rd when the developer would have no rights of access from that side. As part of any construction management plan officers would work to minimise the impacts on the residents and the team were already having detailed discussions with the developer.
- There had been various reports undertaken to try to address issues with the culvert. The Environment Agency had been consulted on this and they had requested a number of conditions which officers put on the application.

Steve Daley responded to the objectors on behalf of the applicant:

The SA21, as was pointed out by the officers involved three sites, their sites, the Iceland site and that on Brook Rd. As part of the application, the team looked at a wider master plan of

how the commercial space could be incorporated within the schemes given that the Iceland site had already been consented. There was a desire and requirement to provide a public route from Hornsey Park Rd through to Brook Rd. There was the question about the commercial space on Hornsey Park Road and it was suggested that it would be fitting for a small office, due to this there was not an anticipation of a great deal of deliveries to a unit of that size. There was a construction management plan which was a condition.

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

- In terms of opening up the culvert, the applicant did not view this as practical in such a short length. River levels changed over time and that could create a number of other issues.
- The applicant had experienced challenges in regard to affordable housing, they were originally looking to provide this on site in Block B. Unfortunately, the financials did not allow this.

The Chair asked Kevin Tohill, Interim Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous decision.

- That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to **GRANT planning permission** subject to the conditions and informatives set out below and the completion of an agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability that secures the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
- 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.
- That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 07/02/2025 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in their sole discretion allow; and
- That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions/Informative Summary - Planning Application HGY/2024/0466 (the full text of recommended conditions/informative is contained in Appendix 2 of the report.

Conditions

1. Time limit
2. Approved Plans and Documents
3. Materials
4. Boundary treatment and access control
5. Landscaping

6. Lighting
7. Site levels
8. Secure by design accreditation
9. Secure by design certification
10. Land contamination
11. Unexpected Contamination
12. NRM
13. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
14. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
15. Delivery and Servicing Plan
16. Cycle Parking
17. Electric Vehicle Charging Points
18. Wheelchair accessible car parking spaces
19. Car parking Management Plan
20. Post-development culvert condition survey
21. Remediation Strategy
22. Investigative Boreholes
23. Verification Report
24. Infiltration Drainage
25. Piling
26. Surface Water Drainage
27. Management and Maintenance
28. Crossrail 2
29. Satellite Antenna
30. Restriction to Telecommunications apparatus
31. Architect Retention
32. Wheelchair Accessible Dwellings
33. Commercial Units – Noise Attenuation
34. Restriction to Use Class
35. Energy Strategy
36. DEN Connection
37. Overheating
38. Living Roof
39. Biodiversity

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Water pressure
- 8) Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit
- 9) Thames Water Underground Wastewater Asset
- 10) Asbestos
- 11) Flood Risk Activity Permit
- 12) Secure by design
- 13) Crossrail 2
- 14) Water Consumption

9. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

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

7:00 – 8:20

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:

- The Capital City College application should be resolved this month.
- Drapers Alms house application was subject to viability discussions. Officers had asked the developers to review this further.
- There were no plans to take International House to QRP as it was considered too small against the QRP threshold at the time. This should come to the committee early next year.
- Former Mary fielding guild home had got an extent permission which had not started on site, but a new application had been validated seeking to change the scheme significantly. Officers were pending more information to assess this before consultation. This would need to come back to committee.
- It was suggested that Reynardson Court title should be changed to 'rear of'.

10. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

12. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting is scheduled for 13th January 2025.