

MINUTES OF THE MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Thursday, 6th November, 2025, 7.00 - 10.30 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Sean O'Donovan, Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice, John Bevan (Vice-Chair), Cathy Brennan, Scott Emery, Emine Ibrahim and Alexandra Worrell

ALSO ATTENDING:

Rob Krzyszowski - Director of Planning & Building Standard, Catherine Smyth - Head of Dev. Manage. and Enf. Planning, Justin Farley - Senior Lawyer, Chris Liasi – Principal Committee Coordinator.

14. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

15. PLANNING PROTOCOL

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

16. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absenceApologies for absence have been received from Councillor Bartlett, Collett and Amin.

.

17. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

18. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

19. MINUTES

RESOLVED:

The minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 9th October were signed and confirmed as a correct record.

20. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

21. HGY/2025/1220 505-511 ARCHWAY ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON, N6 4HX

Matthew Gunning, Area Team Manager, introduced the item.

Proposal: Redevelopment of existing car wash site to provide 16 new council homes comprising a 4-storey building fronting Archway Road and two 2-storey houses fronting Bakers Lane, with associated refuse/recycling stores, cycle stores, service space, amenity space and landscaping.

The scheme had been assessed as sustainable development on previously developed land. It had been designed to deliver sixteen affordable homes in a part of the borough where larger development sites are limited. The housing mix included eight two-bed flats, four one-bed flats, two wheelchair-accessible one-bed homes on the ground floor, and two semi-detached three-bed houses along Bakers Lane. These homes were intended to provide a high-quality residential environment for future occupiers.

The design featured a four-storey block along Archway Road, stepping down to three storeys with a recessed top floor, and two semi-detached houses along Bakers Lane. It had been considered to respond well to the surrounding urban grain and heritage context. The proposal had not been regarded as harmful to the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area or nearby heritage assets. Instead, it had been expected to raise the architectural and townscape quality.

Neighbouring amenity had been protected through satisfactory siting, massing, and separation distances. Although some daylight and sunlight impacts had been identified for properties closest to the site, these had been judged acceptable within a dense urban context. The development would be car-free, with only one accessible parking space provided, and pedestrian improvements such as a new zebra crossing had been secured.

The scheme had incorporated renewable technologies, including EAHPs and PV panels, achieving a 77% reduction in carbon emissions and exceeding London Plan targets. A carbon offset contribution had also been secured. Biodiversity and urban greening requirements had been met through planting, green roofs, and landscaping. The development had been considered Air Quality Neutral, with no significant impact expected.

- Members had questioned how the drainage would be managed. Officers advised that the submitted details for sustainable urban drainage were comprehensive and appropriate.
- Concerns had been raised about the zebra crossings, which were described as potentially difficult to use and not pedestrian-friendly. They asked whether further evaluation would take place. At the start, the applicant and officers had recognised that if a development were to be built here, accessibility would need to improve. The proposal was to install a three-way zebra crossing system;

- however an alternative could be to install a single zebra crossing. Discussions with TFL were expected to continue to reach the best resolution.
- Members enquired as to whether a four storey development could be justified. Officers advised that there is a variety of building typologies and heights in the area, and that the proposed massing and design is considered to respond sensitively to the area.
 - Consultation with the local community was raised, particularly as objections to the scheme centred on where the application had been published in the press, with reference to the advert appearing in the *Haringey Community Press*. Officers explained that the advert was published in the Enfield & Haringey Independent, a locally circulated newspaper; and on their website.
 - In response to Members' questions, Officers confirmed that planning obligations would also be expected to be achieved from this scheme, as they would from a development proposed by any another applicant.
 - It was noted by Members that the Quality Review Panel said the site was challenging from an air pollution and noise stance. Officers advised that the scheme had been assessed from an air quality perspective and found to be acceptable; and that mechanical ventilation, along with triple glazing, would be installed.

Brendon Marczan attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

- The resident stated that he represented residents of his road and other local roads.
- Residents had unanimously objected to the proposal, arguing it was unsafe, excessive, and procedurally flawed. They claimed the Council had failed to follow fair process, with numerous policy breaches, inadequate consultation, and lack of transparency. Concerns had focused on pollution, safety, poor environmental standards, and limited pedestrian access.
- The committee was urged to reject the scheme as legally indefensible, while residents stressed they wanted safe housing through genuine collaboration.
- It was said that the Council had failed to follow lawful, fair, and transparent procedures, citing 13 formal notices, 5 official complaints, 3 Ombudsman investigations, and 124 planning policy breaches, all evidenced in writing. None of these issues had been resolved or acknowledged in the Planning Officer's report, which they described as inaccurate, misleading, and based on flawed technical data.

Councillor Emery attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

- A procedural question was raised in regard to photographs that were taken by the objector. The photographs were then passed around to the committee.
- The resident had argued that the plans were unsafe and flawed, citing traffic risks, poor pedestrian access, overlooking of homes, and unresolved flooding issues. They maintained that consultation had been inadequate and urged the Committee to reject the proposal or refer it to an independent inspector.
- They argued that implementing loading spaces on Archway Road, already a high-risk area with frequent accidents, would worsen safety. Additional turning

movements and pedestrian flows would be introduced without a proper safety review, and the transport assessment lacked a risk mitigation plan. Access to the site would be unsafe, with only informal crossings, raising serious concerns for wheelchair users and families with children.

Members responded to the objectors:

- There was quite a lot of engagement so Members wanted to understand as to how the residents felt they had not been involved in the process. Also, there were to be further discussions, would this change the perception of the project? Officers had stated that consultation on the application had been carried out widely. Site notices had been erected around the area, 113 letters had been sent to residents, and an advert had been placed in the local paper. Officers had also offered to meet the resident at their property to discuss their concerns, but despite discussions over possible dates, the meeting had not taken place as no agreement had been reached by the resident.
- The resident stated that they discovered consultation letters had not been properly sent and, despite raising stage one and stage two complaints, the Council admitted that only 113 letters had been issued instead of the 333 required. Five formal complaints had been raised, including on procedural bias grounds, failures in document keeping and procurement policies, GDPR breaches in the handling of consultation data, and misrepresentation at a cabinet meeting. The procedural unfairness complaint had already been referred to the Ombudsman by the resident. Officers explained that the reference to 333 letters having been sent was a 'typo' and that there was no requirement to send so many letters. Also, all complaints have been and/or would be responded to in due course once officers have had time to analyse the information sent.
- The resident explained that while residents might hold differing views, they would welcome something better than the existing car wash. However, they believed the site had unresolved challenges and that the proposed building was the right redevelopment solution.
-

In response to questions to the applicant:

- A question was raised about the meaning of Flood Risk Zone 1, given anecdotal reports of local flooding. Planning officers had explained that Flood Risk Zone 1 is defined as having a very low probability of river or sea flooding—less than one in 1,000 annually—and is considered the lowest flood risk zone.
- Concerns had been expressed that this did not reflect the realities of the area or future climate risks. Officers had noted that other sources, such as water pipes, might explain local incidents. The Council's flood and water management team, acting as the lead local flood authority, had been consulted on the application and raised no objections, confirming that mitigations were built in. The proposal included softer landscaping and sustainable drainage to reduce runoff and minimise flooding compared to the current hard-standing site.

- Members noted that the scheme had been reported to the Quality Review Panel a number of times and that the scheme responded successfully to their comments.
- Officers advised that there was a clear distinction between officers acting as the applicant and those acting as the Local Planning Authority, with appropriate working relationships taking place.
- Members stated that while photos of flooding appeared shocking, these were considered localised incidents rather than evidence of a long-term problem. The borough's flood management team had determined the site was in Flood Risk Zone 1, meaning very low risk. The current car wash use had created excess water runoff across hard standing, sometimes causing ponding when drains were blocked. Officers believed that, if approved, the proposal with softer landscaping and drainage measures would materially improve conditions and reduce flooding risk
- A question had been raised about whether the housing mix provided the right balance, since 14 of the 16 units were one- or two-bedroom homes, with two family properties proposed. Officers responded that there is a need for all sizes of council accommodation and the mix is acceptable.
-

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendation. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous vote.

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 set out below, and informatives, 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 heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in the report and addendum, 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) be completed no later than December 1st 2025 or within such extended time as the Head of Development or the Director of Planning & Building Standards shall in their sole discretion allow;

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.

2.5 Planning obligations are usually secured through a S106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the local planning authority and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.

2.6 There will also be a Directors' agreement signed between the parties (applicant as the Housing Department and Planning as the Local Planning Authority) to secure obligations that would otherwise ordinarily be set out in a S106 legal agreement.

2.7 It is recognised that the Council cannot enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions, and so prior to issuing any planning permission measures will be agreed between the Council's Housing service and the Planning service, including the resolution of non-compliance with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed on the planning permission for the proposed development.

2.8 The Council cannot impose conditions on a planning permission requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Placemaking and Housing has confirmed in writing that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below will be made to the relevant departments before the proposed development is implemented.

2.9 A summary of the planning obligations/S106 Heads of Terms for the development is provided below:

1. Carbon offset contribution:

- Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £10,830 (indicative), plus a 10% management fee; carbon offset contribution to be re-calculated at £2,850 per tCO₂ at the Energy Plan and Sustainability stages
- 'Be Seen' commitment to upload energy performance data

2. Car-Capped Agreement including a £4,000 contribution to amend the Traffic Management Order

3. Car Club Provision and Membership Planning Sub-Committee Report

4. Enter into an agreement with the Highways Authority under S278 and TfL for the new crossing and necessary highways works

5. Travel Plan contribution: £3,000 (three thousand pounds) per year per travel plan for a period of five years

6. Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution

7. Construction Logistics contribution: £15,000 to administer and oversee construction impacts

8. Off-site highways and Landscaping working

9. Affordable Homes for Social Rent

10. Local Employment

11. Employment and Skills Plan

12. Skills Contribution

13. Energy Plan

14. Sustainability Review

15. Monitoring Costs

2.17 A summary of the recommended conditions for the development is provided below:

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Materials submitted for approval

- 4) Hard and soft landscaping
- 5) Living Roof
- 6) Cycle parking
- 7) Part M4(2) Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings and M4(3) Wheelchair Homes
- 8) Energy Strategy
- 9) Water Butts
- 10) Water consumption
- 11) BNG Plan
- 12) BNG Monitoring
- 13) NRMM
- 14) Section 278 Agreement
- 15) Land contamination
- 16) Unexpected contamination
- 17) Demolition and Construction management plan (DCMP)
- 18) Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan (DCEMP)
- 19) Removal of permitted development rights for extensions
- 20) Satellite dishes/television antennae
- 21) Waste and recycling facilities, and collection
- 22) Considerate constructors scheme
- 23) Secure by design
- 24) Piling
- 25) Overheating report
- 26) Overheating
- 27) Urban greening factor
- 28) Accessible car parking provision
- 29) Delivery and servicing plan and waste management
- 30) External lighting

22. HGY/2022/4319 & HGY/2022/4320 EDMANSONS CLOSE, BRUCE GROVE, LONDON, N17 6XD

Gareth Prosser, Deputy Team Manager, introduced the item.

Proposal: Full planning application and listed building consent application seeking consent for the demolition of existing laundry building and 1970s infill building; alterations and extensions to 44 existing almshouses to create 8 x 1 bed, 12 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed homes; alterations to existing Gatehouse to provide 1 x 2 bed homes; construction of 1 x new build 3 bed home to replace 1970s infill building; construction of a new apartment building comprising 7 x studio homes and 9 x 1 bed homes; construction of 4 x new build 2 bed homes within two new pavilions (2 homes in each pavilion, 4 homes in total); with landscaping; improvements to access; provision of five Blue Badge car parking spaces; and ancillary development thereto.

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

- Questions were raised about where future tenants would come from and whether the Council might seek to house residents on waiting lists within this development. One suggestion had been that, if affordable housing became possible, it should be provided as a financial contribution elsewhere in the borough to avoid overdevelopment of the site. Officers were

congratulated for removing the 1970s block, which was seen as setting a high standard. The applicant was responsible for tenant allocation, while officers explained that early and late-stage reviews would assess economic conditions to determine whether any affordable housing could be achieved in the future. Affordable housing could be delivered on site within the development permitted if it were to become financially viable in the future, though financial contributions remained an alternative option. Officers would seek to secure the best position available if the circumstance were to arise. The applicants are a charity and would use the property for housing, in connection with their charitable purposes.

- Members questioned what would happen to the green space in front of the homes and the plans for the chapel were. The chapel would be used for community use and the green space would be retained, though a some of it would be used a play area for children.

-

Carol Hebbs attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

- The speaker, Chair of the Friends of Bruce Castle and member of the Heritage Quarter Committee, opposed changing the Draper's almshouses from retirement housing to family use. They stressed the buildings' historic value, their Grade II listing, and their original purpose for elderly residents. They highlighted Haringey's growing older population, the need for suitable housing, and the benefits of retaining the almshouses for over-55s, which would ease pressure on social services while preserving heritage and community.

Councillor Ali attended the committee to speak in objection of the application:

- He acknowledged that the applicant had presented a much-improved scheme compared to three years earlier and recognised the need for refurbishment of the site. However, he raised several concerns. He criticised the absence of affordable housing, noting this was the second scheme in the ward within twelve months to lack such provision, despite the area having a large elderly population and significant sheltered housing needs.
- He stated that one- and two-bedroom homes should be retained, questioned the demand for family housing, and asked whether the applicant had sought funding support from the Almshouse Consortium, Homes England, or the GLA. He also highlighted that rental figures provided were outdated, failing to reflect current market conditions.
- Concerns were expressed about families being housed as licensees without secure tenancies, citing past cases of vulnerable residents being evicted.
- Heritage issues were also raised, with calls for input from the conservation officer on balancing historic preservation with energy efficiency measures such as air source heat pumps.
- Finally, the speaker noted that 33 residents had objected to the scheme, particularly over the loss of daylight, which he said was not adequately addressed in the report, especially for residents on Elsdon Road and Harton Road.

Members responded to the objectors:

- Members queried how important the site was to local residents. The speaker explained that the importance of the site was ultimately a matter for the applicant to address. They recalled childhood memories of visiting the almshouses from Lancasterian School during Harvest Festival, emphasising the site's long-standing role in serving the poor elderly. They noted that the almshouses had originally been bound by a covenant designating them for this group, and that this only changed following reforms by the Charity Commission which allowed such covenants to be altered.

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

- Queries were raised about future plans for the almshouses after refurbishment. The applicant explained that costs and listed status made the project complex, but it aimed to find a financially viable scheme while retaining the buildings for charitable purposes.
- It was queried whether housing for the elderly would be included. It was explained that a new apartment block had been specifically designed for older residents, incorporating a lift to address accessibility issues absent in the original almshouses, which had steep, narrow staircases unsuitable for elderly people. The charity emphasised the importance of creating a mixed community with housing for both older and younger people, noting that it was no longer considered good practice to isolate elderly residents. The scheme was praised for following modern trends by combining different age groups within the development
- Questions were raised about whether funding had been sought and if partnerships with housing associations or the Council had been explored. It was explained that every possibility had been considered, including approaches to the GLA, but the accommodation was deemed unsuitable for grants. The applicant stated that if planning consent was to be secured, it would review options and, if unable to proceed alone, would seek suitable partners such as housing associations. The main challenge remained achieving a financially viable scheme to cover refurbishment costs.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendation for the planning application. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a vote of 6 in favour of officers' recommendation, 2 against and 1 abstention.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendation for the listed building consent application. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a vote of 6 in favour of officers' recommendation, 2 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

2.1 That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning and Building Standards to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions set out below and informatives, and the completion of an agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management

and Planning Enforcement 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 and Planning Enforcement 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 27/11/2025 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Director of Planning and Planning Enforcement 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

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Materials & Design Detail
4. Demolition Works
5. Replacement Windows & Doors
6. Details for extension junctions to existing building, chimney, roof and party wall
7. Retrofitting
8. Landscaping
9. Details of ancillary buildings, including cycle store, bin stores, ASHP screening
10. Energy Strategy
11. Whole-House Retrofit Strategy and Monitoring
12. Overheating
13. Living roofs
14. Community Use Plan
15. Demolition and Construction Logistics and Management Plan
16. Cycle Parking
17. Land Contamination
18. Unexpected Contamination (Pollution)
19. NRMM
20. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
21. Waste
22. Secured by Design
23. Secured by Design
24. Tree Protection Plan
25. Surface Water Drainage 1
26. Surface Water Drainage 2
27. Accessible Homes
28. Electric Vehicle Charging Point
29. Removal of Permitted Development

Application HGY/2022/3419 A summary of the recommended conditions for the development is provided below:

Conditions:

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Materials & Design Detail
4. Demolition Works
5. Replacement Windows & Doors
6. Details for extension junctions to existing building, chimney, roof and party wall
7. Retrofitting
8. Landscaping
9. Details of ancillary buildings, including cycle store, bin stores, ASHP screening
10. Energy Strategy
11. Whole-House Retrofit Strategy and Monitoring
12. Overheating
13. Living roofs
14. Biodiversity
15. Demolition and Construction Logistics and Management Plan
16. Cycle Parking
17. Land Contamination
18. Unexpected Contamination (Pollution)
19. NRMM
20. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
21. Waste
22. Secured by Design
23. Secured by Design
24. Tree Protection Plan
25. Surface Water Drainage 1
26. Surface Water Drainage 2
27. Accessible Homes
28. Electric Vehicle Charging Point

23. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

A pre-application presentation was made to the Planning Sub Committee.

The Chair stated that meeting shall continue after 10:00 PM, except that discussion of the specific item or case in hand at 10:00 PM May continue thereafter at the discretion of the chair of the meeting. Consideration of any business remaining would be deferred to the next ordinary meeting, except where the matters fall to be dealt with under the urgency provisions. Which was agreed by the committee to continue the item at hand.

24. PPA/2025/0002 MALLARD PLACE, COBURG ROAD, WOOD GREEN N22 6TS

Valerie Okeiyi, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the item.

The pre-application site is located at Mallard Place on Coburg Road, and is known as 'Chocolate Factory Phase Two'. The proposal seeks to redevelop the site with a 22-storey building and eight-storey wing, alongside a 14-storey building with a six-storey wing, providing 150 social rent dwellings. It also includes double-height affordable workspace, landscaped public realm, and associated facilities.

The site is bounded by Raphael House to the west, Kingfisher Place to the east, and the Chocolate Factory Phase One development to the north, which had already received planning permission for mixed use. At the time, the site was partially occupied by Area 51 Education, a specialist college.

The scheme forms part of site allocation SA19 within the Wood Green Cultural Quarter, which aims to deliver employment-led mixed-use development and high-quality urban realm. The proposal includes a housing mix of one- to four-bed units, affordable workspace, refuse and cycle storage, podium courtyards with play space, green roofs, landscaping, and 12 blue badge parking bays.

The Applicant stated:

- The site lies between the Clarendon Gas Works and the Chocolate Factory developments, with part already holding planning permission. Its design was shaped by nearby transport links and safeguarding lines, requiring taller, slimmer towers. The layout included bike storage, a podium garden, commercial units, and workspace along Coburg Road, with flats arranged efficiently across the towers. Visuals showed the scheme's scale in relation to surrounding developments. The presentation concluded by noting that the project would deliver 150 new council homes at council rent, with an application expected before year's end.

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

- Concerns were raised about whether the 12 accessible parking bays in adjacent areas might cause parking problems for local residents and lead to objections.
- Members welcomed the principle of providing social rent homes in this location
- Members noted that, apart from one home, all dwellings would be dual aspect, which is rare among developments, and welcome.
- Members sought confirmation on building materials, observing that the images suggested render rather than brick, which they considered might be unsuitable. It was clarified that the block would use patterned brickwork with varied balcony materials.
- Questions were raised about which buildings would be demolished and whether the Prime Depot would be relocated. It was confirmed that the church and Prime Depot units would be retained, while the Area 51 Education Centre would be demolished. The Council was still discussing a relocation strategy for existing uses, but no final decision had yet been made.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date

This page is intentionally left blank