

# **MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON Thursday, 29th October, 2015, 7pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, David Beacham, Toni Mallett, James Patterson, John Bevan, Clive Carter, Natan Doron and Elin Weston**

### **34. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

#### **RESOLVED**

- That the Chair's announcement regarding the filming of the meeting for live or subsequent broadcast be noted.

### **35. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ryan and for lateness from Cllr Doron.

### **36. ARCHWAY BRIDGE, HORNSEY LANE LONDON N8**

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant Listed Building consent for proposed anti-suicide measures by installation of fencing to the bridge parapet. 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 Listed Building consent subject to conditions.

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report. In reflection of the joint ownership of the bridge, it was advised that LB Islington had granted Listed Building consent for the scheme on 8 October. The Committee were provided with copies of two emails, one from an objector and the other from a supporter of the application who were unable to attend the meeting to make representations.

[7.30 - Cllr Doron entered the meeting but did not take any part in determination of the application at hand].

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

- In response to a question on the history of the scheme, clarification was provided that the application had been submitted at the end of last year but that negotiations on the final design with partner agencies had been fairly protracted resulting in a delay to the application coming before Committee.

- Concerns were raised over the potential for the unsightly accumulation of litter behind the new fencing and permitting access for litter picking. Officers advised that the potential for litter accumulation would be minimised due to the attachment of the fencing to the main structure. The fencing panels would also be removable to allow maintenance. In light of continued Member concern, it was additionally proposed to amend condition 3 to require submission and approval by the Council of details of the proposed treatment at the base of the structure in order to reduce the likelihood of litter being trapped within the structure.
- Further information was sought on the provision of additional support measures to deter suicide attempts such as information plaques, phones connected to the Samaritans etc. Officers advised that although it was recognised that a physical solution to frustrate access would not constitute a sole remedy, other measures were outside of the remit of the application as well as the borough boundary. Wider discussions were ongoing between the BEH Mental Health Trust and other agencies around additional support arrangements for the bridge. Condition 4 required a review of the anti-suicide signage to the bridge within three months of works commencing.
- In response to points raised, confirmation was provided that removal of the current mesh and spikes would be undertaken as part of the works; the removable strapped mesh panels would allow for the maintenance of the bridge light columns; partner agencies including Heritage England and the Council's conservation officer, had deemed that bridge repair and redecoration was not required as part of the construction works;
- Concern was raised that there could be a period of time during construction works when no anti-suicide measures were in place. In response, officers proposed an additional condition requiring submission and approval by the Council of a scheme for the phased implementation of the works in order to ensure that the safety of pedestrians using the bridge was not compromised as a result of the implementation of the works.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including the amendment to condition 3 covering treatment of the base of the structure for litter picking and an additional condition covering phasing of works and it was

## **RESOLVED**

- That Listed Building consent application HGY/2014/3527 be approved subject to conditions.
1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and specifications and all new external and internal works and finishes and works of making good to the retained fabric, shall match the existing adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material,

colour, texture and profile unless shown otherwise on the drawings or approved documentation:

314774/C/21 Rev C – Existing Bridge Details  
314774/C/31/S4 Rev PL1 – Plan, Elevation and Details  
314774/C/32/S4 Rev PL1 – Elevation and Section Details  
314774/C/33/S4 Rev PL1 – Option 4 3D Views

Reason: In order to conserve the significance of the heritage asset and in order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

3. No development shall commence until the following details have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
- In situ installation of a sample section of fencing;
  - Justification for the extended spikes to the flank piers; and
  - Details for a reversible fixing method that can be used to the end plinths or demonstration that it is not possible

Reason: In order to conserve the significance of the heritage asset.

4. Within three month of the works of the approved scheme commencing, the following shall be undertaken:
- Removal of the modern mesh to the existing balustrade
  - Removal of the existing spikes placed to the external face of the central plinth
  - Agreed plan submitted for CCTV surveillance of the bridge in conjunction with Council and the London Borough of Haringey
  - Review undertaken of the anti-suicide signage on the bridge in conjunction with the Samaritans.

Reason: In order to conserve the significance of the heritage asset.

Informatives:

a) *Positive and proactive manner*

In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. As with all applicants, we have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies, and all other Council guidance, as well as offering a full pre-application advice service, so as to ensure the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably.

### **37. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS**

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

Notwithstanding that this was a formal meeting of the Sub-Committee, no decisions were taken on the following items and any subsequent applications will be the subject

of a report to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee in accordance with standard procedures.

**38. INFILL SITE GARAGES BESIDE 52 TEMPLETON ROAD N15 6RX**

The Committee raised concerns over the following aspects of the draft scheme:

- That the limited number of images contained within the report restricted their ability to comment more fully on the proposed design.
- Proposals for a flat roof construction which would be out of keeping with the surrounding area as well as more problematic in terms of maintenance. The applicant advised that in order to comply with London Plan targets on carbon reduction, the installation of PV panels would likely be required, necessitating a flat roof design.
- The impact of noise from the railway to the rear. The applicant advised that an acoustic survey had identified that standard double glazing would be acceptable to rear facing habitable rooms.

Clarification was provided by the applicant in response to questions that the amenity space would consist of private balconies only; it was intended that Homes for Haringey would manage the properties and that a landscape architect would work on plans to address the issue of the narrow pavement to Hermitage Road.

Members commented that there were inconsistencies in whether pre-application briefings went before Development Management Forum prior to pre-app consideration at Committee and asked where feasible that this occurred.

**39. CROSS LANE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, CROSS LANE, LONDON N8 7SA**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

**40. 109 FORTIS GREEN, LONDON N2 9HR**

The Committee raised concerns over the following aspects of the draft scheme:

- The colour of brick proposed for the scheme. Although the applicant advised this had been selected to pick up similar contemporary buildings in the vicinity including the Police Station, the Committee suggested that the Quality Review Panel's view be sought on this aspect.
- The impact of the scheme on parking in the area. Officers advised that a full transport statement had yet to be undertaken but that existing parking issues were recognised in the area especially around extending the CPZ.
- The loss of employment floorspace. The applicant advised that the current MOT centre employed a small number of workers and that the replacement flexible use space would likely support a greater number of employees. A commitment could not be made however that the commercial space would be designated affordable.
- Lack of provision of an onsite affordable housing contribution. The applicant confirmed that RSLs approached with regard to potential management of onsite affordable units had not expressed interest in taking on such a small number of units. The Committee asked officers to double check if Homes for Haringey had been approached in this regard.

**41. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

9 November.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....