

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.

4. Urgent business

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th September were approved.

RESOLVED

8. HGY/2024/2168 NEWSTEAD, DENEWOOD ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON, N6 4AL

Roland Sheldon, Deputy Team Manager, introduced the application for erection of three buildings to provide 11 residential dwellings, amenity space, greening, cycle parking and associated works.

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

- The report details which trees would be removed had been selected and this had been reviewed by the Council's tree officer and considered to be acceptable.
- The daylight/sunlight assessment had been updated. . As part of the assessment, it was found that there were three windows that were marginally below the vertical sky component guideline. When officers assessed the room the windows served against the no skyline assessment, it comfortably exceeded the BRE guidelines.
- In regard to the location of the bin store, officers looked at the drag distances for waste operatives to go into the site. It was important to balance this up against the distance that residents would have to travel to put the bins in. o
- T Ongoing maintenance of the bin store in the interest of residents'/neighbours' amenity would be ensured through amending the wording of condition 19, if members were minded to grant planning permission.
- In terms of the potential for overshadowing, e officers reviewed the scheme and did not raise any concerns in relation to Courtyard House. In terms of the play area, this was a scheme for 11 homes, and this not being open to the public, and the play area wouldn't be to a scale that would give rise to concerns about an unacceptable noise disturbance.
- There would be 7 trees being removed, there were 3 trees that were approved to be removed in the previous scheme that were also being removed here. There were

also some trees that had to be removed to facilitate the development; officers tried to work with the developer to minimise the number of trees that would be removed.

Marc Prevezer attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

This scheme was high density, out of keeping with the whole street, harmful to neighbouring amenity, and would result in loss of light, there was also a lack of consultation with residents.

Lesley Reynolds attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

If approved this development would replace a scenic outlook with a large imposing brick wall and parking was already dire in the area. In summary, residents urged the committee to recognise the overwhelming evidence of overdevelopment, the negative impact on existing residents and the inadequacy of proposed mitigations. The scheme in its current form was simply not suitable.

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

- The terraces were stepped and the closest one to the street was 3.9 metres and the farthest one was five metres from the back of pavement.
- Residents explained that they felt there was zero direct consultation with the developers and had asked them on numerous occasions through their agents to come down to the site and discuss the objections to avoid any potential legal issues.

The applicant responded to the objectors:

The applicant was fully committed to delivering this scheme and subject to planning permission would intend to start works as early as next spring if possible. Since they acquired the site in 2023, they had redeveloped proposals for 11x3 bed and 4x4 bed family homes which directly addressed some of the original feedback from both residents and stakeholders. They had worked closely with officers during that period with statutory consultees and the local community to ensure the new homes were both fully compliant with policy, but also sympathetic to the local architecture and the conservation area.

The landscaping strategy provided green amenity space, including private terraces and rear gardens, a shared community garden and informal play area, and with 30 new trees being planted, which represented an overall net gain of 23 trees across the site.

They had engaged with the local community and officers, including meetings with the Highgate Society, the Conservation Area Advisory Committee and neighbours, and the feedback had been instrumental in shaping the scheme. There were two initial consultations which all neighbours were invited to and since then there had been several exchanges over e-mail with various neighbours who've engaged to our communications consultants.

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

- In terms of the greening to the side wall facing onto the garden of 280 Inwood Road, neighbours had mentioned a living green wall. Green walls were notoriously difficult to establish and maintain, they had to also bear in mind that this wouldn't be on a commercially managed property, it would be attached to the side of a private house which would be sold within its own freehold.

- The bin store would have a solid roof which would also be comprised of a green roof. There would be a condition regarding maintenance.
- Neighbour correspondence was sent to over 150 surrounding addresses, notifying the local community of the launch of the consultation, providing contact details for any inquiries, there were two meetings with local community stakeholders, the Highgate Society and the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee, - online and in person, which all neighbours were invited to.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement to sum up the recommendation as set out in the report. Condition 19, relating to the Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management Plan would be amended to ensure ongoing maintenance of the bin store . The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following 3 absentions, 7 in favour and 0 objections.

RESOLVED

2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning & Building Standards is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below

2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning & Building Standards to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms 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 section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 31 October 2025 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability shall in her/his 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 Summary – Planning Application HGY/2024/2168 (full text of conditions - Appendix 01).

- 1) Time Limit (Compliance)
- 2) Approved Plans and Documents (Compliance)
- 3) Materials (Prior to commencement of relevant part)
- 4) Design and Detailing (Prior to commencement of relevant part)
- 5) Boundary treatment and access control (Pre-occupation)
- 6) Landscaping (Prior to commencement of relevant part)
- 7) Biodiversity (Pre-commencement)

- 8) Lighting (Pre-occupation)
- 9) Screening Planting (Pre-occupation)
- 10) Noise from building services plant and vents (Compliance)
- 11) Secure by Design Accreditation (Pre-above ground works)
- 12) Secured by Design Certification (Pre-occupation)
- 13) Drainage and SUDS Strategy (Compliance)
- 14) Piling Method Statement (Pre-commencement)
- 15) Land Contamination (Pre-commencement)
- 16) Unexpected contamination (If identified)
- 17) NRMM (Pre-commencement)
- 18) Management and Control of Dust (Pre-commencement)
- 19) Delivery and Servicing and Waste Management Plan (Pre-occupation)
- 20) Construction Logistics and Management Plan (Pre-commencement)
- 21) Considerate Constructors (Compliance)
- 22) Energy Strategy (Pre-above ground works)
- 23) Overheating (Pre-above ground works)
- 24) Urban Greening Factor (Compliance)
- 25) Water Butts (Pre-occupation)
- 26) Arboricultural Method Statement (Compliance)
- 27) Cycle Parking (pre-occupation)
- 28) Electric Vehicle Charging (Pre-occupation)
- 29) Accessible Parking Bay (Pre-commencement)
- 30) Car Parking Management Plan (Pre-occupation)
- 31) Waste/Recycling Storage (Prior to commencement of relevant part)
- 32) Restriction to Telecommunications Apparatus (Restriction)
- 33) Building Regulations Part M (Compliance)
- 34) Removal of Permitted Development Rights (Restriction)
- 35) Water consumption

9. HGY/2024/3386 312 HIGH ROAD N15 4BN

Kwaku Bossman-Gymera, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report for change of use from former educational facility (D1 use class now replaced by new class F1) to short term

supported emergency accommodation (sui generis use class). The proposal also includes erection of roof extension to the building with erection of two new single storey buildings to the rear; and provision of a new commercial use on part of the ground floor level.

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

- There was a homeless day centre close but that was not an accommodation service. It's a day centre for people that were rough sleeping and would be of benefit to this proposed development that the services were very closely located. There was also a supported housing service above Marbury Junction that was commissioned. The accommodation would be staffed 24/7. Officers were confident with the risk management measures that had been proposed.
- . There would be people with needs living in this accommodation, this wasn't a static cohort of people.
- Officers wouldn't be referring anybody to this property who's under the age of 18.
- The management plan in place was to ensure that this would be a secure building.
- There were 44 single adults in commercial hotels in total across the Temporary Accommodation (TA) cohort and 700 adults in temporary accommodation. Each month officers were approached by between 350-500 people seeking housing. Everything indicated that this was likely to increase, and the Council did not have the supply currently to meet the demand for homelessness accommodation.
- In terms of waste management officers were satisfied with the measures that had been put in place. A condition had been imposed to ensure that this plan was reviewed.
- A specialist landscape architect was appointed to consider how the landscaping of the courtyard could create a series of pleasant outdoor spaces and sitting areas. It was an early stage but that would be subject to condition.

Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement summarised a late representation:

The objection, in summary, was concerned about adding pressure to local benefit and employment support systems, undermining active community programmes which benefited residents, increasing the potential for antisocial incidents and the need to support employment.

Cllr Makbule Gunes, Ward Councillor for South Tottenham attended the committee to speak in objection:

All ward councillors had strong concerns regarding the application, including about an increase of anti-social behaviour. She did not believe residents had been consulted with properly and there was no guarantee this property would house Haringey residents. The applicant attended the committee and spoke in support of the application:

The applicant had engaged with the local planning authority and with the housing authority. They had held a pre application briefing for Members of the Planning Sub-Committee, and invited members down to their other, similar, development in Newham.

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

- The building was currently being used on an adhoc basis.

- There would be two staff working 24/7 and security cameras throughout the building. There would also be managers, caseworkers and support workers on site during the day. The applicant was well versed with providing this sort of facility.
- In the past, they had other properties where there were couples mixing with singles. This was where antisocial behaviour was far greater because there was an unbalanced mix of who's in the building.
- Open space and communal rooms within the development would assist in reducing residents' loneliness
- The rates would be agreed with the Council; this could be anywhere between £45 to £55 a night per person. The larger spaces had a premium rent over the slightly smaller ones. The rates were similar to emergency accommodation rates.
- There was a proposed separate refuse and cycling store on the southern boundary that would be enclosed, and the applicant had provided the number of euro bins required and requested by the refuse department.
- By way of comparison, the Council were currently paying between £75 and £85 a night per person for hotel accommodation.
- There would be possibility, within the leasing of the café, to include a caveat that there should be some form of apprenticeship or link with the homeless facility, the applicants would be happy to include this in the legal agreement.
- In terms of the cost the applicant would bear all the additional costs.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement to sum up the recommendation as set out in the report. During discussions, two additional section 106 obligations had been identified that the applicant had agreed to. Firstly, that residents of the property would be involved in the planting of the landscaped areas. Secondly there would be a connection between the supported accommodation and work experience in the cafe. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following 6 in favour and 2 objections and one abstention

RESOLVED

2.1 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 6/11/2025 or 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/2024/3386 (the full text of recommended conditions/informative is contained in Appendix 1 of the report.

Conditions

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Detailed Drawings and External Materials
4. Management Plan
5. Restricted Use
6. Hard and Soft Landscaping
7. Secure by Design Accreditation
8. Contaminated Land
9. Unexpected Contamination
10. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM)
11. Management and Control of Dust
12. Considerate Constructor Scheme
13. Delivery and Servicing Plan and Waste Management Plan
14. Cycle Parking
15. Electric Vehicle Charging
16. Entry Access Gate Arrangements
17. Accessible Parking Bays
18. Energy Strategy
19. Overheating Report
20. Living roofs
21. BREEAM Certificate
22. Archaeology
23. Commercial Unit – Noise Attenuation
24. Commercial Unit - Hours of operation
25. Accessible Accommodation
26. Refuse, Waste & Recycling Details
27. Extract flues/Fan
28. Fire Safety

29.CCTV (Pre Commencement)

30. Restriction to Telecommunication Apparatus

10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

There were no questions on this item.

11. DELEGATED DECISIONS

There were no questions on this item.

12. ITEMS OF NEW URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

6th November