

MINUTES OF MEETING

Strategic Planning Committee held on 7:00 – 8:20

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS.

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

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Collett and Councillor Ibrahim.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were no deputations/petitions/presentations/questions.

6. MINUTES

Minutes 17th October. RESOLVED

Officers noted that following discussion in the previous meeting, the infrastructure funding statement would be brought to the next committee in July. In the meantime, officers would organise a meeting for members to catch up on this.

7. PLANNING AND BUILDING CONTROL 2024/25 Q3 UPDATE

National Planning Reform and Development Management -

Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

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

- The planning fee increase coming in, on April 1st, is a national increase, however in the longer term the government would give the ability to set local fees.
- Performance on 'Majors', 'Minors' and 'Others' planning applications was very good, with 100%, 91% and 93% determined on time
- None of the 45 planning appeal decisions were overturned by the Planning Inspectorate
- There was pressure on the enforcement team, the number of HMO applications meant their case load had increased dramatically. Officers were in discussions with the HMO team, and it had been agreed that the HMO team would send planning officers a pack of information regarding each license request.

- The proposal of three to five members on the planning committee was quite small for a borough with as many residents as Haringey.
- Clarity was given that the years reported were financial years.
- Clarity was given that the 'portal' referred to was the planning webpages.
- The Government proposals for including unelected independent experts on Committees included them having a vote
- Officers were continuing to actively seek removal of redundant phone boxes where they are unnecessary street clutter
- Officers had not completed a Haringey Council response to Government proposals, but they had been feeding into industry responses through groups such as London Councils, the Local Government Association and The Royal Town Planning Institute. The issues and concerns raised by members were the same as those officers had raised in these industry responses.
- Officers had an independent peer review last year and it was noted that Haringey had a well ran planning committee.
- Only approximately 1-2 applications per year in Haringey would meet the Government's proposed new threshold for needing to be decided by 'strategic' Committees. Whilst that threshold may be appropriate for areas with new towns / urban extensions, it may not be appropriate for an urban borough such as Haringey
- There was general support for training for Committees
- Officers were happy to have a discussion with the cabinet member to discuss forming a Haringey specific response to Government proposals. This consultation is just an initial 'working paper' consultation, there will be further, more formal, consultations from the Government in due course as the proposals evolve.

Spatial Planning –

Bryce Tudball, Head of Spatial Planning introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

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

- In regard to the housing delivery test measurement, the government had an annual measurement. This looked at how housing delivery compared to housing targets and Haringey was performing well in this regard; the measurement over the last reported three years was 99%.
- Officers were proposing that their affordable housing targets and policies would be consistent across the entire borough. There would be no variation between the West, the centre of the borough and the East. Officers sought to increase social housing delivery in the West of the borough through identifying more sites and more opportunities. In relation to the Gypsy and traveller need, the housing delivery team had recently consulted on three new gypsy/traveller sites. There could be difficulty in identifying further sites, particularly the large scale, but nonetheless that was a challenge the team would take on fully.
- Currently there was a different tenure mix policy between the Tottenham Area Action Plan area and the rest of the borough and officers proposed to have a single tenure mix. That tenure mix would be either 60/40 in favour of social rent or possibly 70/30. The Council would be moving in direction of more social housing rather than less in terms of the affordable housing policy itself.
- The housing target requirement in 2021 and 2022 was lower than the Council's ordinary housing target. The reason for this was because of an allowance the government made for COVID, this partly explained the current figure of 99%. There was no longer any grace due to COVID. Next year's completions figure is likely to drop from the currently-reported 99%.

- It was noted that the Local Plan engagement had happened a while ago and there was a need for the Local Plan to be updated to reflect the current priorities of the borough.
- There had been an extensive amount of work in relation to the Local Plan. Officers were now in a position where they could commit to an early summer date for cabinet.

Building Control –

Rob Krzyszowski introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

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

- Officers would inform members of new staffing posts, in terms of the team structure for the direct 'building control' service there were three directly-employed permanent staff members. Officers would seek to increase that to 10-15.
- There had been delays across the country in terms of applications being determined by the Building Safety Regulator. The BSR took its formal powers around April last year. Concerns had been raised to Government and since, the Government have announced an extra £1,000,000 for the building safety regulator [post meeting correction: the figure is actually £2,000,000].
- There were planning policies which required developers to provide microclimate assessments. This would look at things such as wind and the comfort level as a pedestrian walking or cycling. The Council had some existing policies on that, but through the new Local Plan, officers would be enhancing policies and using London plan policy and guidance which would strengthen the requirements for developers.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

8. Internal Audit - Planning

Rob Krzyszowski, Assistant Director for Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

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

- With regard to the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR), up until four years ago, the GLA carried out monitoring via something called the London Development Database. This system pulled large amounts of data out of the planning portal and enabled officers to easily understand what was happening in the borough. The decision about five years ago to move from that to a new planning London data hub had some issues in terms of how the new system communicated with their own planning system; this took a further three years to resolve, at which point the team had a backlog of three years of planning information. The issues had now been fixed, so the team were in a position to move forward with that.
- In addition, there was a vacant role in the team that officers were hoping to repurpose to be a full-time monitoring and data role.

RESOLVED

That this report be noted

9. Haringey Local Development Scheme

Bryce Tudball, Head of Spatial Planning introduced the report as set out in the agenda pack.

- Officers had gone down the route of having a comprehensive Local Plan for the entire borough. There was a lot of work undertaken from 2013 to 2018 on the Wood Green Area Action Plan but this was delayed due to Crossrail 2. There was no longer work happening on that, which would have had significant implications for Wood Green, officers made the decision that Wood Green would be folded into the Local Plan.

RESOLVED

That this report be noted and agreed.

10. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS.

There were no new items of urgent business.

11. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS.

The date of the next meeting is TBC