

# **MINUTES OF THE MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Monday, 13th January, 2025, 7:20 - 9:20**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Councillors: Lester Buxton, Sean O'Donovan, Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Alexandra Worrell, John Bevan, Cathy Brennan and Scott Emery, 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 for absence were received from Cllr Bartlett.

### **4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

### **5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr Ibrahim declared an interest for item 9 due to being ward councillor for Noel Park, she confirmed that she would view the item with an open mind.

### **6. MINUTES**

#### **RESOLVED**

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 9<sup>th</sup> December as a correct record.

### **7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted. The meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes from 7.02pm-7.12pm to allow members of the PSC to review the addendum.

### **8. HGY/2023/0894 27-31 GARMAN ROAD N17 0UP**

Sarah Madondo, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report for erection of two replacement industrial units, designed to match the original units, following fire damage and demolition of the original units.

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

- This was previously developed land and located in flood risk zone 2.
- The fire at this development happened in 2019, officers did not have details of what happened. The proposed building is not a high rise building subject to Gateway One; and fire matters would be considered in detail through Building Regulations.
- Not all commercial developments need parking on site, this would depend on the plans for usage. There will need to be a section 278 agreement secured under the planning obligations. It is not uncommon for industrial estates to have offloading taking place on the carriageway.
- A financial obligation towards employment initiatives is calculated on the basis of a formula.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, 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 & Planning Enforcement 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 a legal agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, that secures the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms.

That the legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above, is to be completed no later than 3 months from the date of the Planning Sub-Committee meeting or within such extended time as the Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability/ Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement shall in his sole discretion allow; and

2.3 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission shall be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions and informatives; and

2.4 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Assistant Director for 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. Summary Lists of Conditions, Informatives and Heads of Terms Summary of Conditions (the full text of the recommended conditions can be found in Appendix 1 of this report).

#### Conditions

1. Three-year time period limit
2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials
4. Land contamination
5. Unexpected contamination
6. NRMM

7. Construction Environmental Management Plan
8. Energy Strategy
9. Overheating
10. BREEAM Certificate
11. Secured by Design Accreditation
12. Secured by Design Certification
13. External lighting
14. Waste and recycling
15. Restriction of use
16. Drainage
17. Noise
18. Construction Management Plan
19. Delivery and Servicing Plan
20. Fire statement
21. Disabled Bays
22. Cycle Parking

## 9. HGY/2024/2279 25-27 CLARENDON ROAD N8 0DD

Valerie Okeiyi, Principal Planning Officer introduced the report for demolition of existing buildings and delivery of a new co-living development and affordable workspace, alongside public realm improvements, soft and hard landscaping, cycle parking, servicing and delivery details and refuse and recycling provision.

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

- The principle of doing payment in lieu calculations is the same as it would be for a general residential scheme. This would be through the residual land value calculation. This looks at scheme costs and revenue.
- Noise would be controlled through Building Control and Building Regulations.
- The HSE was consulted and satisfied that two staircases had been proposed. The fire statement was submitted and received no objections.
- The strategic housing market assessment is one of the evidence-based documents that is informing the emerging new Local Plan. This could be shared with members, and it would be published as part of the new Local Plan. This specifically looks at including a new policy on co-living, officers would take on board feedback from members.
- It is common that there would be viability assessments submitted with major residential planning applications. When a developer submits a viability assessment, there are reasonable costs to meet and a profit to generate , in order to facilitate the redevelopment being delivered.
- The minimum requirement of stay for the students would be three months, as required by the London Plan. Officers were not aware that there was a maximum stay allowable, this would up for negotiation between the applicant and the Council.
- Officers have had extensive discussion with the applicant regarding Section 278 works and as part of that, a car parking bay would be provided for people with disabilities; along with a servicing bay.
- In terms of refuse collection, a condition requires submission of a Delivery and Servicing Plan, including details of waste management
- Excluding bills rent would be £1050 monthly per person; similar to the cost of renting in a HMO in the area.

Sian Roberts, Chief Executive of the Electoral Reform Services (ERS) attended the committee to speak in objection of the application. She stated that the electoral reform services staff had

not been properly engaged with by the developer. Her second point was around the planning application proposal, saying she felt they had not been properly replied to by planning officers. She proposed that there would be a pause, and that a decision not be made by the Committee until the group had been engaged with. They were also planning on installing solar panels, and her view is that this development would interfere with them.

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

- The objector had contacted officers from the Council and various councillors on this issue, to no avail. Officers advised that our consultation on the planning application was thorough.
- Officers explained to members that records show that the group were consulted, records of this could be found on the planning website. Officers had spoken to another member of staff (who wasn't present at the committee) and explained that they were unable to discuss whether the scheme would be approved or refused as the case as the application was still under consideration.
- Site notices were erected around the site, and the proposal was also advertised in the local press.
- In 2017/2018, ERS responded on the Local Plan consultation. They had employed specialist planning agents to respond on their behalf. They considered mixed use, residential led, development was now inevitable at this location; and that ERS would need to ensure that its own site could be developed in a similar way to its neighbours.
- A public exhibition was held by the developer for this scheme in May 2024. The applicant submitted a Statement of Community Involvement with their application, detailing their public consultation. Officers also held a Development Management Forum for the proposed development, which is advertised by site notice, inviting anyone interested in the local area, including neighbouring occupiers, to join that meeting. The council go beyond the statutory minimum in terms of planning consultation requirements.

Richard Quelch, Sarah Christie and Rob High, the applicant, spoke in support of the application. They had been in discussions with officers regarding these proposals since 2023. They had had a range of pre application discussions with the Council, including meeting with sustainability and transport officers. They had also worked with the Quality Review Panel and met the Planning Committee at the pre application stage last summer. They undertook public consultation on the scheme. In May 2024, they consulted circa 860 surrounding properties and businesses. Feedback from design officers, the Highways Department, the local lead flood authority, sustainability officers, the HSE and TfL was all positive regarding the scheme.

This scheme not only met the London plan shared living guidance, it exceeded it in a number of key areas, including the design standards on minimum studio sizes and amount of both internal and external amenity space. This scheme design had incorporated lessons learned from previous co living schemes in terms of studio layouts, amenity design to be 'best in class', the studios were well designed and at an average of 21 square metres.

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

- The applicant met with the Civica Centre on the 25th of January 2023 to discuss bringing forward their site and the relationship of the two sites. Following this, the applicant further developed the plans and there was subsequently the public consultation event, where invites went out to 860 properties and businesses in the area.
- There would be a minimum stay for students of 3 months, there was no reference to a maximum stay.

- From the applicant's perspective, they did seek to engage and develop a wider masterplan with neighbouring owners. In terms of moving forward, they would be happy to meet with Civica to discuss the way in which the scheme would be built.
- The applicant could not verify the £10,000 cost for solar panels, their building was also further to the north which would minimise the impact from this scheme. There could be other alternatives, for example air source heat pumps that could possibly assist in terms of achieving the CO2 reduction that was being sought.

Officers advised that it was important to note that the council have a development plan led system and that a decision must be made in accordance with the development plan, unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise. The site allocation for this site says a tall building would be acceptable, and the principle of a mixed-use development is already accepted, with the site allocation having been consulted on over seven to eight years ago. Civica wrote to the council and supported the principle. A proposal to install solar panels now is in the knowledge that the area would be coming forward for redevelopment. . The other point that is raised in the September ERS consultation letter was around the 'right to light'. Officers advised that there is a separate legislative regime for this.

The applicant agreed to add a recommendation to consult with electoral services.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. The proposal is for demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site for a co living development and affordable workspace; with public realm improvements, soft and hard landscaping cycle parking, servicing and deliveries facilities, and refuse and recycling facilities. The recommendation is for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement, and Members are also asked to note the addendum in those matters. It is also recommended that the developer would consult with neighbours on the CMP required under condition 3, which will be amended appropriately to incorporate that requirement. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous decision.

## RESOLVED

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 a section 106 legal 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.

2.2 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.

2.3 That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 07/03/2025 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

2.4 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/2024/2279 (the full text of recommended conditions/informative is contained in Appendix 1 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. NRMM
13. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
14. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
15. Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management
16. Cycle Parking
17. Basement Impact Assessment
18. Surface Water Drainage
19. Management and Maintenance
20. Piling
21. Thames Water Essential Infrastructure
22. Satellite Antenna
23. Restriction to Telecommunications apparatus
24. Architect Retention
25. Accessible Co-Living Accommodation
26. Noise Attenuation – Co-Living Accommodation
27. Restriction to Use Class
28. Energy Strategy
29. Overheating
30. BREEAM Certificate for “Excellent”
31. Living Roofs
32. Biodiversity Net Gain
33. Water consumption
34. Co-living Management Plan

**Informatives**

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- Page 95
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Water pressure
- 8) Asbestos
- 9) Secure by design

## **10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

The following was noted following questions from members:

- The Capital City College application was nearly complete, there were a few more points which required clarification.
- Officers would look into Berol Yard in more detail and inform members.

### **RESOLVED**

To note the report.

## **11. 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.

## **12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no new items of urgent business.

## **13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for 3<sup>rd</sup> February (since cancelled so next meeting is 4<sup>th</sup> March 2025).

CHAIR:

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....