

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 Ibrahim, Cllr Collett and Cllr Bartlett

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr O'Donovan declared an interest in regard to item 9 as chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park board.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 2nd June.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2025/0617 37-39 WEST ROAD N17 0RN (PAGES 5 - 162)

Sarah Madondo, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the item for demolition of all buildings and structures and the construction of a building for flexible Class B2 general industrial, B8 storage and distribution, and E(g)(iii) light industrial uses with ancillary office, associated service yard, access point, car parking, and landscape planting.

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

- Two trees were being retained, and the section 106 would allow for 6 more trees. This is considered to be an acceptable improvement.
- This proposal would include servicing and parking on site, taking stress off the highway, which would not interfere with Spurs event day parking
- The exact brick to be used in the development would be decided on in the future, as the building industry is currently finding that bricks are not consistently available. The brick to be used would be secured by condition and agreed by Officers in advance of building works.
- With upskilling, the employees that they would expect on site were a mix of logistic experts and office workers. The employment initiatives that officers were securing in

the section 106 was helping towards training and was also securing a portion of jobs to be for residents.

- The stage one and two road safety audits were carried out as part of the detailed design. All lorries would be able to turn within the site and enter and leave in forward gear; and visibility at the entrance and pedestrian safety have been prioritised.
- There is a standard condition recommended securing submission of samples and details of timber materials. Officers would make sure that the timber cladding detailing specification is robust and that it would age/weather well.
- The café currently on site does not have planning permission, the developer has not incorporated that as part of this development, but this could relocate in the area.
- In terms of the 22 car parking spaces, the proposal had been assessed in line with the London plan requirements, and it fulfils those requirements. Officers noted the issue about parking pressures and had secured a financial contribution towards reviewing parking management measures in the area which could lead to a CPZ.
- A contribution was secured from the applicant towards delivering enhanced highways conditions, which would uplift this area.
- The committee thanked the applicants for their strong response to the points raised in the QRP report.

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

RESOLVED

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Director of Planning and Building Standards or the Head of Development Management is authorized to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a legal agreement providing the obligations as set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2.2 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 their 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 or the Director of Planning and Building Standards to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions and informatives 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. Development begun no later than three years from date of decision

7:00 – 10.15pm

2. In accordance with approved plans
3. Materials submitted for approval
4. Land contamination
5. Unexpected contamination
6. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
7. Demolition Management Plan and Construction Management Plan (with Demolition Logistics Plan and Construction Logistics Plan)
8. Restrictive uses classes
9. Cycle Parking Design and Layout
10. Surface Water Drainage
11. Secure by design accreditation
12. Energy Strategy
13. Overheating
14. Urban Greening factor
15. BREEAM
16. External lighting
17. Boundary treatment
18. Plant Noise
19. Delivery/Service plan and Waste Management
20. Disabled parking bays
21. Car Parking Design and Management Plan
22. Electric Vehicle charging
23. Hard and soft landscaping works
24. Tree Protection
25. Living Roofs
26. DEN connection 2
7. Management and Control of dust
28. Considerate construction
29. Fire Statement

Informatives

- 1) CIL
- 2) NPPF
- 3) Land Ownership
- 4) Hours of construction
- 5) Party Wall Act
- 6) London Fire Brigade
- 7) Thames Water
- 8) Advertisement
- 9) Secure by design
- 10) Pollution

9. HGY/2023/2584 13 BEDFORD ROAD N22 7AU (PAGES 163 - 370)

Valerie Okeiyi, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the item for demolition of the existing building and the erection of a new mixed use development up to five storeys high with commercial uses (Use Class E) at ground level, 12 no. self-contained flats (Use Class C3) to upper levels and plant room at basement level. Provision of cycle parking, refuse, recycling and storage. Lift overrun, plant enclosure and photovoltaic (PV) panels at roof level.

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

- Condition 22 regarding the living roof related to the green roof and the green wall, there was also condition 5 which related to landscaping, so these crossed over.
- The applicants had produced a revised daylight and sunlight impact, at Officer's request. The impact arising from the development on neighbours' amenity was justifiable in the circumstances.
- Every traffic management order prepared, in connection with events at Alexandra Palace, would need to take into consideration access for future residents to their property. This would be the same for the existing garage who need access to their MOT service and their customers. If there was any mass crowd movement for safety and anti-terrorism reasons, officers may not allow any access at all, but in preparing a demolition/construction management plan which is a condition attached to this application, the developer would have to take into consideration any known road closures that were proposed at Alexandra Palace.
- The affordable housing the scheme could viably deliver is 3 shared ownership homes, which equated to 25% affordable housing. However, a further appraisal was carried out to see whether any social rented homes could be delivered. In this instance it was concluded that the scheme would generate a deficit, meaning there would be no social rented homes.
- The policy is to provide affordable housing on site in the first instance. The viability work had started off on that basis. The policy also says that where there were legitimate viability issues and circumstances that there could instead be a payment in lieu, and that was the case here. It had not been possible to secure a registered provider on site. The Council itself was not interested in purchasing the affordable homes for its own use.
- An existing kerb into the site would be removed and the footway reinstated, with single yellow lines to allow for temporary collection of rubbish. The management company would bring bins to the kerb on the day of collection. The rubbish truck would stop for 5-10 minutes and load them in. This is a small redevelopment, which officers did not envisage would cause any traffic problems.
- The QRP agreed that this was an appropriate height and scale of development for this site. There would be an increase of height of one storey compared to the existing neighbour and the further retail parades along Bedford Rd.
- Regarding the affordable housing payment in lieu (PIL) to be secured in the section 106 legal agreement, this could be spent on affordable housing, including social rent. Officers were working in partnership with the Council's housing delivery programme to ensure the PIL is spent appropriately, including within the new build Council housing proposals.
- How CIL income is spent is not a formal decision for this committee. This is ultimately decided through cabinet powers, but the types of things CIL can be spent on are projects such as delivery of green and open space, play space, transport infrastructure and highways and road infrastructure.
- The applicant revised their affordable housing viability statement providing further evidence, and discussions had since taken place between the applicant and the independent assessor, which is BNPP, and with that in mind, it was found that 3 shared ownership homes could be delivered, which equated to 25% affordable housing. Alternatively, less than one social rent home could be delivered on site.
- Profit margins that were built into the viability appraisal by the developer were considered by BNPP and agreed. They were looking at a profit that was within a reasonable amount.

- The viability appraisal is to negate the effect of any inflated land value. It looked at existing use value.
- In terms of the premium, the applicant's viability assessors assumed a 20% premium. To incentivise the landowner to bring the site forward for development when the viability review went to BNPP, they took a 10% landowner premium as a reasonable amount. Early and late-stage reviews of the scheme would take place, so that the Council can secure additional value that might arise.
- Marc Simon, a local resident attended the committee to speak in objection of the proposal. He was glad to see that there was a fire statement that appeared satisfactory to building control, but disappointed that a landscape architect had not been involved in the scheme. They questioned how the green wall would survive.
- Ruth Cowan, a local resident attended the committee to speak in objection of the proposal. Whilst she was in favour of the creation of more housing in the borough, especially affordable housing, she had concerns around the consideration of the light and privacy impacts to Palace Mansions and Forest Lodge; concerns that the style and height of the building doesn't relate to other homes on Bedford Rd or Alexandra Park Rd; and concerns about the pressure on car parking provision in the local area.

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

- Neither of the residents had further discussions with the applicant.
- Cars would be moved to park on the roads further down, creating pressure.
- It was important that this would be a wheelchair accessible property.
- In terms of the fire safety concerns and the fire statement, this was submitted and reviewed by building control officers and planning officers who were satisfied that the policy requirement had been sufficiently addressed. A formal detailed assessment would be undertaken for fire safety at the formal building control stage.
- It was also worth noting this building is not a high-risk building in terms of the definition of building safety, so it did not meet the criteria of needing to be considered by the National Building Safety regulator.

The applicant attended the committee and spoke in support of the application:

- For many years, this site had operated as a petrol station and a car repair garage, but currently the site was outdated, underutilised and no longer aligned with Haringey's vision for regeneration, sustainability or good design. Its current use contributed very little to the neighbourhood, generating noise emissions and formed a long-standing eyesore within the local environment. The proposed scheme had been designed to contribute meaningfully to the local area, bringing forward much needed new homes, active commercial frontage and significant environmental improvements. The application was a result of extended extensive collaboration with council officers and stakeholders. The applicant had participated in three formal pre application meetings, a full design review panel process, a signed planning performance agreement and detailed technical dialogue around design, servicing and amenity.
- They had also engaged with residents early in the process, listening carefully to feedback and responding constructively. The scheme evolved as a result, with reductions in height and massing, improved materials, enhanced refuge, refuse arrangements and open space provision. Finally, the wider economic benefit the proposal represents is over £4 million worth of private investment. It will generate approximately £40,000 annually in Council tax and business rates helping local services for years to come.

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

- Officers submitted a basement impact assessment which took into consideration the excavations and all the hydrology of the immediate area. As previously mentioned, this development had been seen by building control, and detailed structural analysis would be undertaken.
- All flats would be dual aspect and triple aspect.
- There was the possibility of some street tree planting, however, there was a recent set back in that an initial survey indicates that services may be located under the pavement which may not allow tree planting. The S106 requires exploration of services below the pavement and if there was a possibility of planting.
- As the architect noted, there would be a feasibility study to see if trees in front of the site could be planted. If trees could not be planted due to utilities / services on the street outside the site, a payment in lieu would be made towards greening in the local area.
- The maintenance of the building would be down to the management company of the block.
- There are fuel tanks in the ground, so the site would need to be de-contaminated.
- There was an internal lift to the building which would provide adequate suitable access to all the flats. All flats would be part M2 compliant, so they were accessible; with one flat suitable for use by a wheelchair user.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendation as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a vote 6 for, 1 in abstention.

That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management or the Director of Planning and Building Standards 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 Director of Planning and Building Standards 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 Director of Planning and Building Standards 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 21/08/2025 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Director of Planning & Building Standards 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/2023/2584 (the full text of recommended conditions/informative is contained in Appendix 2 of the report. Conditions

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Detailed Drawings and External Materials
4. Boundary Treatment
5. Hard and Soft Landscaping
6. Site levels
7. External Lighting
8. Secure by Design Accreditation
9. Secure by Design Certification

7:00 – 10.15pm

10. Contaminated Land
11. Unexpected Contamination
12. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM)
13. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
14. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
15. Delivery and Servicing Plan and waste Management Plan
16. Cycle Parking
17. Car parking Management Plan
18. Energy Strategy
19. Overheating Report
20. Sustainability Strategy
21. Living roofs and walls
22. Biodiversity Measures
23. BREEAM
24. Detailed Basement Impact Assessment
25. Piling (Thames Water)
26. Piling and Deep Foundations (Environment Agency)
27. Underground Strategic Water Main (Thames Water)
28. Surface Water Drainage (LBH Flood and Water Management Lead)
29. Management/Maintenance (Flood and Water Management Lead)
30. Remediation Strategy and Verification Plan (Environment Agency)
31. Verification Report (Environment Agency)
32. Satellite dish/television antenna
33. Extract flues/fans
34. Telecommunications infrastructure
35. Fire safety
36. Noise from Plant/Equipment
37. Commercial Units – Noise Attenuation
38. Commercial units - Hours of operation
39. Restriction to Use Class
40. Commercial Shopfront
41. Shopfront Advertising Signs
42. Air Quality Neutral
43. Architect Retention
44. Wheelchair Accessible Dwellings

Informatives

- 1) Positive and Proactive
- 2) Permission subject to a 106 legal agreement
- 3) CIL
- 4) Hours of Construction
- 5) Party Wall Act
- 6) Naming and Numbering
- 7) Fire Brigade
- 8) Asbestos
- 9) Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime
- 10) Thames Water - Groundwater Risk Management Permit
- 11) Thames Water - Water Pressure
- 12) Water Consumption

10. PRE APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The following items were pre-application presentations to the Planning Sub Committee and discussion of proposals.

11. HGY/2024/3386 312 HIGH ROAD N15 4BN (PAGES 371 - 402)

Kwaku Bossman- Gyamera, principal planning officer, introduced a planning application which seeks consent for refurbishment, conversion, and extension of the existing building, along with the construction of two new single storey buildings to the rear. The scheme would retain commercial use on part of the ground floor and would provide 52 partially self-contained units, providing short term emergency accommodation.

The Chair read out the following, committee procedure rules, standing order 18, 'no meeting shall continue after 10 p.m., except that discussion of the specific item or case in hand at 10 p.m. may continue thereafter at the discretion of the Chair of the meeting'. Consideration of any business remaining shall be deferred to the next ordinary meeting, except where the matter(s) falls to be dealt with under the urgency provisions.

The following comments were made by the applicant, in response to questions from the committee:

- The applicant has owned the property for many years and is a profit-making company with 30 years' experience in this field; the Joy Foundation is a trading name.
- The company run a similar purpose built 35-unit facility on Prince Regent Lane, in LB Newham; which is also a controlled environment in terms of access to the premises.
- There was going to be a detailed management plan submitted with the application and that would detail how the facility would be run; the document would be secured under legal agreement.
- There would be a lot of surveillance to prevent anti-social behaviour. There would be 2 security staff on the premises 24/7. There could be up to 6-7 staff there during the day.
- There would be a legal agreement obligation which meant that the owner would have to offer the temporary accommodation to Haringey residents first.
- A landscape architect's input would be hugely beneficial at the design stage, particularly around the outdoor spaces.
- There would be quality brickwork and green roofs which would be fully accessible.
- There would be a mix of people in all sorts of circumstances. The proposal had been discussed with the Council's Housing officers.
- The fees would be set by the Council, and likely be between £45 and £55 per night, the £55 would be the price for the accommodation for wheelchair users.
- This was a good location because there were street frontage and a secure gate. There would always be excellent staffing and two security staff present.
- The applicant was not seeking to retain the existing church, and community uses on the upper floor. They were proposing to bring back a retail use on the ground floor so that there would be some clear communication with the street and the retail frontage, this would be open to the public.