

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 19 JANUARY 2015**

Councillors: Ahmet (Chair), Basu, Beacham, Bevan, Carroll, Carter, Gunes, Mallett (Vice-Chair), Patterson and Rice

<b>MINUTE NO.</b>	<b>SUBJECT/DECISION</b>
PC10.	<p><b>APOLOGIES</b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Akwasi-Ayisi.</p>
PC11.	<p><b>MINUTES</b></p> <p>Clarification was sought on the reason for the inclusion of informative 4 for the West Green Road application from 15 December meeting. Officers advised that specifying minimum Thames Water pressure levels and flow rates allowed the developer to take them into account within the scheme design. It could not be added as a condition as it lay outside of the direct control of the applicant.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the minutes of the Planning Committees held on 10 and 17 November and 15 December be approved.</li> </ul>
PC12.	<p><b>FORMER POLICE STATION, MAGISTRATE'S COURT AND TELFER HOUSE, CORNER OF BISHOPS ROAD, CHURCH ROAD AND ARCHWAY ROAD N6 4NW</b></p> <p>The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and construction of a part 3 to part 7 storey apartment block and a 3 storey mews block to provide 82 residential flats, including basement and undercroft car parking with 41 spaces and comprehensive landscaping of the site. The report set out details of the proposal, the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, equalities and human rights implications and recommended to grant permission subject to conditions and subject to a s106 legal agreement.</p> <p>The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. The Committee's attention was drawn to a tabled addendum setting out details of a further representation received; an amendment to s106 head of terms covering car club membership and car parking management plan; a number of amendments to conditions; and a Conservation Officer response covering the impact of the development on the nearby listed church. An amendment was also advised to the recommendation set out within the report to read <i>'that the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives and subject to sec. 106 Legal Agreement to secure the following matters.....'</i></p> <p>The Committee were advised that the Council's new draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) was due to go to Cabinet on 20 January for</p>

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MONDAY, 19 JANUARY 2015

approval to release for public consultation. Although the document had limited weight at the current stage, it identified for the site a 5 storey height limit but with the potential for a higher element to mark the transition towards Archway Road local shopping centre. The officer view was also outlined that the scheme would have limited to no impact on the setting of the nearby church when assessed against the enhancement of the Conservation Area by virtue of the redevelopment of the site.

A number of objectors to the application addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The mass, height and bulk of the scheme was of concern, in particular the increase to 7 storeys on Archway Road, and which would have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and damage heritage assets.
- The 7 storey element would set a precedent for the development of taller buildings within the Conservation Area.
- Although new developments and affordable housing provision were welcomed in Highgate, following the consultation with local people on the development of the Site Allocations DPD, an agreed brief had been outlined for the site centred on a 2-3 storey building rising to 4-5 storeys on Archway Road. The Highgate Forum were therefore upset that the Council had departed from this position.
- Density levels for the scheme were considered too high and set in order to ensure the viability of the scheme. Levels should be lowered to protect the Conservation Area.
- No separate assessment had been made of the scheme against development plan policy.
- The scheme was at odds with certain elements of the National Planning Policy framework, Haringey and London Plan policies including that it sought to maximise and not optimise development potential, would breach the building line to Bishops Road in order to accommodate the scale and set a density towards the higher level of that permitted.
- Objections to the application had been raised at numerous stages of the planning process and had not been resolved by subsequent cosmetic changes. Objections had been submitted by the Corporation of London, Highgate Society, Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee, Highgate Action Group, Haringey Design Panel and local residents.
- The benefits of the scheme did not outweigh the harm caused to the Conservation Area.
- It was requested that the Committee refuse or defer the application to allow significant reductions to be made to its scale.
- Concerns were raised over the design of the scheme including the creation of north facing, single aspect units, ground floor flats located within the apex that would lack natural light and balconies that were too closely located for privacy.

A representative from the City of London Corporation addressed the Committee as the owner and manager of Highgate Woods and raised the following points:

- The Corporation could not support the application due to concerns over the impact of the scheme on the adjoining Highgate Woods which were designated Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and the Conservation Area.
- The application was contrary to the Site Allocations DPD which outlined a 4-5 storey building for the site, the Unitary Development Plan in not

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 19 JANUARY 2015**

protecting or enhancing MOL and to adopted and emerging planning policy through an unacceptable impact on the openness of MOL.

- Massing diagrams demonstrated that a 7 storey building would be visible from the Woods, particularly in winter months and would therefore have an overbearing visual effect and be detrimental to the MOL and Conservation Area

Cllrs Hare and Morris addressed the Committee as local ward councillors and raised the following points:

- The lack of evidence to support the substantial increase in height of development permitted on the site from the 4-5 storeys outlined within the early consultation draft of the new Site Allocations DPD.
- The site should not be classified as a gateway site, particularly considering Archway Road was predominantly made up of 2-3 storey buildings. Allowing a higher development would set a dangerous precedent for taller buildings in the area.
- The density of the scheme was too high resulting in site cramming and was inconsistent with that permitted at other Highgate development sites.
- Concerns were expressed over the advance of the building line to Bishops Road.
- It was suggested that the developer had overbid on the land and therefore was seeking to make up the difference through high densities and fewer affordable housing units.
- Documents obtained via a Freedom of Information request identified that the Council's Conservation Officer had had concerns regarding the impact of the scheme on the Conservation Area relating to bulk and massing and density, particularly to the tower.
- A poor quality design resulted in a number of flats being north facing, single aspect with kitchens provided with no natural light.
- The scheme contained an under provision of affordable housing

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The high quality, sensitive design was appropriate for the area and utilised an accessible, brown field site.
- The scheme would provide a 32% onsite affordable housing contribution, a tenure lacking in the west of the borough.
- A series of pre-application meetings had been held with planning officers, local residents and community groups and which had resulted in a number of changes to the final design submitted.
- The density had been reduced from that originally proposed and was appropriate for the site in line with Mayoral standards.
- Benefits of the scheme included the provision of a number of family units, a tenure blind design, high quality amenity space and children's play facilities.
- The scheme would not break the skyline or be visible from the playing fields in Highgate Woods.

The Committee raised the following points and questions in discussion of the application:

- Clarification was sought from officers on the compatibility of the scheme

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 19 JANUARY 2015**

with the Conservation Area. Officers outlined the sensitive, high quality nature of the design including the stepping of the building with lower height to residential side streets and the distinctive focal point to the streetscape provided by the higher tower element. The design was not considered to be out of scale or context with the local area, which included buildings of variable heights.

- The Conservation Officer was asked to confirm her view of the scheme following the comments made by the ward councillors. She confirmed that the email obtained under the Freedom of Information request dated back to May 2014, at which point the proposed density levels for the scheme had been higher. Subsequent changes made to the application since this time had required a reanalysis of the scheme and the final position reached of no formal objection on conservation grounds as set out within the report.
- In response to a question regarding the impact on MOL, officers advised that the development would not be seen from the main open space within the woods or have a visible impact beyond that made by the current and surrounding buildings
- In response to the concerns raised over the density level of the scheme, it was advised that the officer view was development on the site had been optimised as opposed to maximised as supported by the quality of the residential units. The site had good transport links and was located on a main road thereby rendering a higher density level appropriate. In response to a further question regarding a link between the sale price of the plot and high density levels, it was advised that the sale price of the land was not factored into the viability assessment under which the affordable housing contribution had been assessed.
- The applicant confirmed in response to concerns regarding the impact of the apex design to natural light received to lower floor accommodation that units were not located within the corner of the apex at ground level and that the units at first floor level were triple aspect. All units had been assessed as compliant with daylight/sunlight requirements.
- In response to concerns regarding balcony design, the applicant advised that they formed an important part of the design, would meet required standards and have glazed balustrades. The applicant provided additional assurance that the scheme contained no single aspect, north facing units, with all flats dual aspect as a central part of the design.
- Confirmation was provided that the central courtyard would be accessible for all residents of the scheme and that a proportion of the parking provision would be allocated to the affordable housing units under the management plan.

Cllr Carter asked that officers note his comment regarding the terms used to describe development land.

Cllr Carter, seconded by Cllr Beacham, put forward a motion to reject the application on the grounds that the 7 storey tower was incompatible with a Conservation Area; the density of the scheme was too high; the scheme was not set back to Bishops Road; the building line on Bishops Road was not observed; the balconies were unrealistic and concerns over height and massing. Following a vote, the motion fell.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report and it was

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 19 JANUARY 2015**

	<p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That planning application HGY/2014/2464 be approved subject to conditions and subject to a s106 legal agreement.</li></ul>
<b>PC13.</b>	<p><b>UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS</b></p> <p>The Committee considered an update on major planning proposals in the pipeline.</p> <p>Concern was raised over the scale of development potentially to be brought forward at Hale Wharf, particularly proposals for an up to 16 storey building. Officers advised that the scheme was at very early application phase, with the planning service yet to take a view on proposals and which would be made within the context of Tottenham Hale's growth area designation, development potential and good transport links which supported higher density schemes. It was anticipated that early proposals would be submitted to a pre-application Planning Committee in March.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the affordable housing contribution for the Furnival House scheme. It was confirmed that the permission granted in 2010 included an £1.5m offsite affordable housing contribution to be paid on completion. It was advised that it would not be feasible to renegotiate the s106 agreement as part of the determination of the s73 application due for submission.</p> <p>Cllr Rice requested additional details on the Lea Valley Techno Park application. Officers advised that an extension was planned within the envelope of the school building and that further details would be emailed to Cllr Rice.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That the report be noted.</li></ul>
<b>PC14.</b>	<p><b>APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS</b></p> <p>The Committee considered an update report on applications determined under delegated powers between 1 and 31 December 2014.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• That the report be noted.</li></ul>
<b>PC15.</b>	<p><b>DATE OF NEXT MEETING</b></p> <p>The Chair advised that the next scheduled meeting on 27 January would be cancelled as there were currently no pre-application briefings requiring consideration.</p> <p>The Planning Committee meeting on 16 February had been provisionally allocated for the Alexandra Palace planning application.</p>

COUNCILLOR AHMET  
Chair