

**PLANNING & REGENERATION
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

MINUTES

Meeting : Development Management Forum - 596-606 High Rd , N17
 Date : 25th February 2010
 Place : 639 High Road, Tottenham N17 8BD
 Present : Paul Smith (Chair), Architect Agent, Nigel Norie, Chris Burford,
 2 Representatives from Quaker Association
 Minutes by : Tay Makoon

Distribution :

		Action
<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>Paul Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced officers, members and the applicant's representatives. He explained the purpose of the meeting that it was not a decision making meeting, the house keeping rules, he explained the agenda and that the meeting will be minuted and attached to the officers report for the Planning Committee.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey buildings to provide 39 residential units including 175 sqm of A1/A2/A3 floorspace with formation of vehicular access.</p> <p>Presentation by Joanne Groarke –Planning Consultants and Kevin Goodwin – Agent</p> <p>The presentation was delivered by slide presentation giving information about the history.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We made a planning application in 2008 for the redevelopment of the site. With an arrangement of blocks to the front and three central blocks to the back and home zone within the blocks and new entrance from the high road through where the previously demolished building (not demolished by our client) had previously been and the Council refused it planning permission on a number of issues. Our client appealed that decision and in February 2009, the appealed decision was issued and the inspector saw three principal issues that were considered at the inquiry which took place in January last year. 	

The issues were :

- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Tottenham High Road Conservation Area
- Highways safety in terms of where we were proposing the access
- The living conditions of future residents.

The inspector dismissed the appeal. It was a very narrow ground on which the appeal was dismissed. We thought we could overcome any issues the inspector had and essentially that set the brief for the site, we visited the planning office, talked to planners, conservation officer to discuss how we might modify the scheme to overcome the inspector's concern and the impact on the scheme on the conservation area and various suggestions were put forward for modifying the front elevation the block fronting on the High road and how that relates to the streetscape and fenestration on the high road and also how by changing the height of the building we can lower the height of the scheme and make it more consistent. Here we have the revised scheme we have put in for planning permission and conservation area consent to demolish the tired building in the conservation area that still stands. The vehicular and pedestrian entrance is essentially in the same place, in the gap formed by the demolished building, the pattern of development in terms of block alignment throughout the scheme is the same, the mix of accommodation has changed and we have reduced the number of units from 48 to 39, we have changed the mix between houses and flats within the scheme. It's the same configuration. The scheme is aimed at code level 4 for sustainable homes; it has a high proportion of renewable energy in it. The scheme has pitched roof to take advantage of the south facing sun.

Questions:

Q1: Are you responsible for the site as it is now?

Ans: Client is the owner of the site; they did not demolish. Someone came along, knocked down the boundary wall and tipped a load of rubbish on the land. The site is in the Conservation Area and they are responsible for the land as it stands now. Our client bought the site in the current state; they did not demolish the pub or any other building.

Q2: Was the building that was knocked down a listed building?

Ans: It was a building in the conservation area and I don't think it was listed and there was a permission to put a replacement building which hasn't been implemented back and we saw this as an opportunity in order to provide and access into the site. The permission may have expired now, one of the arguments was in terms of refusal last time, they were not happy with us using the gap and this was form to have access into our site.

That was one of the issues the inspector had last year. He did say that the gap could stay and that we could access into our site.

Q3: Am I right in looking at the plans that you do not own the Titanic café and does Rock one own 596 High Road and does it intend to demolish it.

Ans: That correct. We do not own Titanic café; our plans are marked with a red line round our site.

Q4: Do you happen to know, what are the thoughts about the development and does it fit with the Titanic Café as part of this historic development?

Ans: At the moment it would stay as it is, clearly if permission were to be granted for this site and that scheme came forward you could look at that as a refurbishment and look at the opportunity it might produce. Permission has been granted for the infill site pub.

From the Council's point of view: Where you get development in this nature you may through the same architects be able to follow through the design and carry on to the next property.

Q5: Where will people park?

Ans: There is no parking on site as the location is accessible by public transport. It is considered that this development does not need parking.

Q6: Can cars go in to drop off?

Ans: Access to be pre-arranged for deliveries only by the management company to provide access through a secure area at the front, access for refuse collection and emergency services only, this is due to the access being on the high road.

Q7: Are visitors allowed to park?

Ans: No, there won't be access for visitors or people living on the site.

Q8: The flats that are next to our garden – do they have windows overlooking our gardens?

Ans: There are no windows overlooking your garden on the end elevation.

Q9: What is the length of that house? It looks about 20 feet. It looks about 1/3 of the length of the burial ground.

Ans: The depth of the flank wall is about 11 metres long.

Q10: Is this the same design as the last scheme- it's 3 floors instead of 4 floors?

Ans The massing is the same, the elevation treatment is completely different, it was all flat roof and we have gone for a more traditional design this time. The number of units is down.

Q11: How you got the numbers for the social housing?

Ans: 50% social housing and at present it is proposed that it would be all of block C and D.

Q12: What do you mean by social housing?

Ans: Registered Social Landlord, Housing Association would manage the blocks.

Q13: What is the feedback from Haringey Planning Service- does it fit in?

Ans: So far we have been told it meets policies. We have had pre-application discussion and so far all seems fine and going in the right direction, although we have not yet had comments from the Conservation Officer.

Q14: The retained building - Rock one is committed to remain owner of that retained building and to be responsible for its implementation.

Ans: Everything depends on whether permission is granted –If planning permission were granted there are two routes - Rock One would enable the developments themselves or they may decide to sell to registered social landlord in it's entirety who would then manage the affordable block and then dispose of the private units on the front.

Q15: Drains issues between 596 and the new build. Which will need to report to our overall Quaker Housing Trust, and we will be hoping for cooperation that maximises co-operation and minimises costs to all concern on what seem a complex problem.

Comment from Joanne - Any works that is governed by the party wall act, a party wall notice will be served yourself and the applicants – such as shared drains etc.

Q16: It says a development of this size may damage archaeological remains?

Ans: Normally there would be a desk base assessment and this would be inline with what English Heritage have asked and we submitted one with the last application. The Heritage comments have gone into this application. This allows us to put retained building in the context it use to be and the derelict building son the site.

Paul Smith reminded everyone to submit their comments to the Planning Service if not already done so and further representations can be made at Planning Committee. He thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.

End of meeting

--	--	--