

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

HELD ON Monday 11th January 2016, 7pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Peray Ahmet (Chair), David Beacham, John Bevan, Vincent Carroll, Clive Carter, Toni Mallett, James Patterson, Elin Weston, Makbule Gunes and Reg Rice

1. **FILMING AT MEETINGS RESOLVED**

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

2. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Basu, Doron and Ryan. Cllrs Gunes and Rice substituted.

3. **11 PARK ROAD**

The Chair advised that the item had been withdrawn from the agenda due to the applicant being unable to attend the meeting.

4. **255 LORDSHIP LANE**

The Committee considered a report on the application to grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing building, construction of a new road and construction of a lower ground, first, second and set back third storey building comprising of 31 new residential flats and 150 sq.m. of new office space. 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. The planning officer advised of an amendment to the recommendation set out within the report which should read 'to grant permission subject to conditions, a S106 legal agreement *and S278 and S38 legal agreements*'.

The planning officer gave a short presentation highlighting the key aspects of the report.

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

- Clarification was sought on how the differing ground levels between the proposed communal garden space and the gardens on the adjacent Lido Square properties would be managed. It was advised that the communal garden would be at a raised level atop the car park and would be provided with a landscaping screen to reduce overlooking plus a stepped down approach using a 1.5m strip of land plus boundary treatment to bridge the gap between the different garden threshold levels.

- Clarification was sought on the width of the new road and access arrangements for refuse vehicles. Officers confirmed that the road at 5.5m width would be compliant with Manual for Streets standards and although the design was at preliminary stage, would constitute an improvement on the current access road. The new road would be able to accommodate refuse vehicles.
- The Chair expressed disappointment over the low level of affordable housing proposed and sought clarification on the proposed associated review mechanism. Officers advised that the contribution had been independently assessed as being at the maximum reasonable level, primarily a factor of the construction costs associated with the new road. Officers proposed an amendment to the affordable housing review mechanism set out within the report, to base the assessment on the build costs of the scheme, including construction of the new road, instead of the customary sale values in the area. The legal officer advised that the proposed s106 legal agreement Heads of Terms as set out within the report would require amendment to reflect the proposed change to the review mechanism and proposed that it be delegated to officers to set out the detailed terms. The applicant provided further details of the extensive two year design process undertaken for the scheme including the production of outline plans for two schemes, with and without construction of a new road. The scheme incorporating the road had been progressed due to the associated benefits of opening up the rear of the site as well as improving the vicinity. A separate application, currently at pre-application stage, was being developed for the regeneration of the depot site to the rear and which was projected at the current time to be able to support a 35-50% affordable housing contribution.
- In response to a question regarding delivery of the three affordable housing units, officers provided assurance that negotiation undertaken via the review mechanism would not lower but only seek to increase the number of affordable units provided. The Committee sought clarification on the future management of the three affordable housing units. The applicant advised that a decision had yet to be made as to whether a registered social landlord would be engaged or the units managed directly by the applicant.
- Clarification was sought on the allocation process for the three affordable housing units to be let at intermediate rent level and whether priority would be given to residents on the Haringey Housing Register. The applicant advised that the terms of the rent offer was still in discussion with the Housing Service but stated that the applicant would welcome nominations from the Council for allocation of the units. Confirmation was also provided that the scheme would be tenure blind, with one entrance to all of the residential units.
- The Committee sought clarification over the source of funding for the construction of the new road. Officers advised that the road would be built by the applicant at no cost to the Council due to the associated land swap from the change in location of the road. The legal officer advised that the details of any land swap arrangements were not relevant to the determination of the application.

In response to requests from the Committee, officers proposed amendments to existing or additional conditions to cover a ban on the erection of satellite dishes and external metal shutters to the commercial units; an additional condition covering landscaping and requiring a landscape management plan and for the provision of obscure glazing to balconies.

The Committee sought clarification as to whether a condition could be imposed to give priority to residents on the Haringey Housing Register in the allocation of the intermediate rent units. Officers advised that although this could not be imposed as a condition, the clear steer provided by the Committee in this regard would be taken forward by officers in negotiation with the applicant on the s106 legal agreement. The Chair requested that an update on negotiations be provided back to the Committee in due course.

The Chair moved the recommendation of the report including amended conditions to require opaque glazing to balconies; a ban on external metal shutters to the commercial units; provision of a communal TV aerial system; landscaping and a landscaping management plan condition and a change to s106 Heads of Terms for approval to be subject to a review mechanism prior to occupation, details of which would be delegated to Head Development Management to determine and it was

RESOLVED

- That planning application HGY/2015/2321 be approved subject to conditions and subject to s106, s278 and s38 legal agreements.

5. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

The Committee considered an update on major planning proposals in the pipeline.

The following comments were made on applications:

2 Canning Crescent N22

It was requested that consideration be given to offering Homes for Haringey the opportunity to manage the onsite affordable housing units if a registered social landlord could not be found.

Tottenham Hotspur stadium redevelopment and 44 White Hart Lane

ClIr Bevan requested that discharge of a number of conditions under the approved application including details of match day road sweeping contributions and the community involvement programme come back before the Committee. The Head of Development Management advised that these elements were not conditioned but were s106 obligations and as such had been approved as part of the determination of the application by the Committee on 16 December. Revisiting this element would require a review of the whole decision. The Legal Officer urged the Committee to exercise extreme caution in discussions on potentially reopening a decision within a public meeting with no supporting papers and without the presence of the applicant or interested parties. He requested that any outstanding issues in this regard should be taken up outside the meeting with senior planning officers. Additionally, the Chair identified that the issues raised would fall within the remit of the resident business liaison group to be established for the scheme as well as the local area management plan and group, thereby providing the opportunity for local people and ward councillors to provide input.

Land of Brook Road N22

Clarification was sought on whether this was part of the Heartlands scheme and if such, concern over the principle of permitting residential development when it was considered that originally this area had been outlined for employment land use. Clarification was also sought on how this application linked into the Wood Green Area

Action Plan. Officers identified that the proposal for the site was at very preliminary stage and had yet to be assessed by planners. An update would be sought and provided to the Committee at the next meeting.

191-201 Archway Road

Confirmation was sought as to whether the application, including the revised BRE report, would be considered at the 28 January meeting. Officers advised that the application would be submitted to a January or February Committee..

6. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Committee considered a report setting out decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period from 23 November to 18 December 2015.

1-18 and 33-44 Summersby Road N6.

Concerns were raised on Homes for Haringey putting forward proposals for uPVC replacement windows and doors to properties within a Conservation Area. Officers advised that the planning service was generally robust in outlining the unacceptability of uPVC windows and doors within Conservation Areas and would be working with HfH going forward on plans for the estate. The Head of Development Management agreed to discuss with Cllr Carter his outstanding questions regarding the estate outside of the meeting.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 28 January 2016.

CHAIR: Councillor Peray Ahmet

Signed by Chair

Date