

MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 2019, 7.00 - 8.40 PM

PRESENT:

Councillors: Vincent Carroll (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair), Dhiren Basu, John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Justin Hinchcliffe, Peter Mitchell, Yvonne Say and Reg Rice

372. FILMING AT MEETINGS

Noted.

373. PLANNING PROTOCOL

Noted.

374. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ross, Tabois and Williams.

Councillor Rice was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Williams.

375. URGENT BUSINESS

None.

376. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

377. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 7 October 2019 be approved.

378. HGY/2019/1183 - 1-6 CRESCENT MEWS N22 7GG

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of the existing buildings, retention of slab level, perimeter wall along northern boundary of site, and wall adjacent to Dagmar Road gardens, and redevelopment of the site to provide two 3 storey blocks fronting Crescent Mews, a 1 to 2 storey block adjacent to Dagmar Road and a 4 storey building to the rear comprising 30 residential units (Use Class C3), including 3 disabled car parking spaces, associated landscaping and cycle parking within the development and a new paved and landscaped lane at the front of the development with street lighting. Installation of vehicle and pedestrian access gates at

entrance to mews and erection of boundary treatment to the rear of the commercial units.

Mr Duncan Edwards addressed the Committee in objection to the application. He informed the Committee that the information provided in relation to the development was either misrepresented or side-tracked. The density of the development had not changed following public consultation, despite the applicant stating that it had reduced by 14%. The cross-section plans did not show a gap between Block D and 37 Crescent Road. The window survey stopped at 11 Crescent Road and provided no information for 13-27 Crescent Road. Blocks C and D unreasonably compromised the amenity of neighbouring developments.

Ms Gudrun Parasie addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The plans for the development had been poorly consulted on, and the development was out of character for the area. The site was unsafe for pedestrians, who would have to share the entrance space with service and other vehicles. The Network Rail stipulation that buildings should be 2m from their boundary had been ignored. Increased carbon emissions would not be reduced by the offsetting payments.

Councillor da Costa addressed the Committee in objection to the application. There was general agreement that the site was suitable for development, and that additional housing was required in Haringey. However, there were concerns with the development as a whole. Paragraph 4.2.3 of the addendum did not address the issues raised in terms of bulk and massing of the two blocks. The change to the outlook of the buildings would be unacceptable to the amenity of properties on Crescent and Dagmar Roads. If the concerns raised in relation to Block C and D were addressed, the development would be more acceptable to local residents.

John Ferguson, Applicant's Representative, addressed the Committee. The team has worked hard over two years to develop the proposal and had attended two Quality Review Panels, Development Management Forums, and a pre-application meeting. The feedback received from these had been used in the creation of the scheme. The site was a vacant brownfield, former industrial site and the development would regenerate the site to provide high quality housing. Following feedback on previous plans, the development had been reduced to move blocks C and D away from the perimeter of the site, and the height had been reduced from 4 storeys. This had been supported by the Quality Review Panel.

The new London Plan policy D6 required developments to optimise the development of a site, and the proposed density of housing on this site complied with this as well Local Policy DM11. The windows in the properties were carefully angled and positioned so as not to provide an adverse impact on neighbouring properties. The daylight and sunlight impact had been carefully considered, with 306 of 307 windows meeting the BRE guidelines. Good quality amenity space was provided for all units, with an accessible children's play space on the roof terrace of Block C.

The development would provide 30 high quality homes, which would meet or exceed London Plan standards. The affordable housing contribution would be 35%, and the Council would have the first option to purchase the properties.

Mr Ferguson and Council Officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- A public consultation was carried out in 2018. 3500 leaflets had been locally distributed, and 13 responses received.
- The social housing was located closest to the entrance to the site, so there would still be the option to have refuse and recycling collected by the Council if the Council chose to purchase the properties.
- The windows in Blocks C and D faced towards the rear of the properties. The Applicant's design access statement referred to the distance between the window and neighbouring properties as 20m. The window of the 3rd bedroom (single) of the block D house was 16m from the rear of Dagmar Road. The window of the 2nd bedroom was 18m from the rear of Dagmar Road. Officers considered that only the single bedroom window could present reasonable concern, but this would be considered a minor loss of privacy as it was unlikely that the bedroom would be used as often as other rooms.
- There was one unit with no private external amenity space. Block C had no balconies, but it was considered that the roof terrace would offset this.
- The buildings would be predominantly brick. The wall at the boundary to the rail track would be rendered, to match the existing wall.
- The development was not in a designated ecological area, however a condition had been included to require the installation of bat / bird boxes.
- Although fire safety was not a material planning consideration, the London Fire Brigade were satisfied with the proposed development.
- There would have to be a discussion with the Council in terms of render finish, but it was likely that the product used would have the paint mixed in with the render – which would not require repainting. The walls would have a flush finish, so there would be no areas where grime could accumulate.
- Part of the s106 agreement included a £50k contribution to CPZ consultation. The parking survey included in the report identified that there was likely to be additional parking, hence the measures included in the s106 agreement. It was important to remember however, that s106 contributions were not made to solve existing problems, but to mitigate any issues which would increase as a result of a development.
- There was a condition for a construction / transport management plan included, however the detail would need to be approved by the Transport team when it was developed.

The Chair moved that the application be approved, and following a vote with seven in favour, one against and one abstention it was

RESOLVED

- i. To grant planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives as set out in the Committee report,

subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms as set out in the Committee report;

- ii. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms 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 Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-committee.
- iii. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (i) above is to be completed no later than 20 December 2019 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and
- iv. That following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (i) within the time period provided for in resolution (iii) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions listed at section 9.0.
- v. That in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (i) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (iii) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:
 - (i) In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable housing and 2) viability review mechanism, the scheme would fail to foster mixed and balanced neighbourhoods where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies 3.9, 3.11 and 3.12, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP2, and Development Management DPD Policies DM11, DM13 and DM48.
 - (ii) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards the loss of non-designated employment floorspace, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on re-provision of new employment floorspace to support local demand for a range of employment uses. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policy 4.4, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP7 and Development Management DPD Policies DM40 and DM48.
 - (iii) In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) residential Travel Plan and Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments and 2) financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, car club funding and parking control measures, the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies 6.9, 6.11 and 6.13, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP7 and Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM48.

- (iv) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a carbon offset payment and updated energy plan, the proposal would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal is unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy 5.2, Strategic Policy SP4 and Development Management DPD Policies DM21, DM22 and DM48
 - (v) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards child play space, the proposal would fail to deliver an acceptable level of play and informal recreation based on the expected child population generated by the scheme. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policy 3.6, the Mayor's Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG and Local Plan Strategic Policy SP13.
 - (vi) In the absence of a legal agreement securing a financial contribution towards construction training and local labour initiatives, the proposal would fail to deliver an acceptable level of support towards local residents accessing the new job opportunities in the construction phase of the scheme. As such, the proposal is contrary to Haringey's Planning Obligations SPD 2014.
 - (i) In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme, the development would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies 5.3 and 7.15, Local Plan Strategic Policy SP11 and Development Management DPD Policies DM1 and DM48.
- vi. In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (v) above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:
- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations;
 - (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal; and
 - (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (i) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

379. PPA/2019/0012 - LOCK KEEPERS COTTAGES, FERRY LANE

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

380. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

381. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

382. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

383. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

13 January 2020

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair

Date