

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 2022, 7.00 - 8.05 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Councillor Gina Adamou, Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Barbara Blake, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim, Councillor Liz Morris, Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross, and Councillor Yvonne Say.

In attendance: Councillor John Bevan, Cabinet Member for Planning, Licensing, and Housing Services.

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. PLANNING PROTOCOL

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Mitchell. Councillor Barbara Blake was in attendance as substitute.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair noted that there were no new items of urgent business but that there was a late appendix and late information in relation to Item 7, HGY/2021/3175 – High Road West, N17. Under s100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair was of the opinion that these should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances. These circumstances are so that the additional information could be considered by the Planning Sub Committee at its meeting on 17 March 2022.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Peacock noted that she did not consider that she had any interests to declare but, given some recent correspondence that had been received, she stated that she would like to place on record that she would be considering the planning decisions at the meeting with an open mind and had taken into account all relevant, material planning considerations.

Cllr Ibrahim noted that she did not consider that she had any interests which would disqualify her from voting but, given some recent correspondence that had been received, she stated that she would like to place on record that she would be considering the planning decisions at the meeting with an open mind and had taken into account all relevant, material planning considerations. As one of the objectors for Item 7, HGY/2021/3175 – High Road West, N17, was Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, Cllr Ibrahim also noted that she was an Arsenal supporter and a member of AISA (Arsenal Independent Supporters' Association). She stated that she would take part in the discussion and voting and would be considering the item with an open mind.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chair referred to the note on planning applications and this information was noted.

7. HGY/2021/3175 - HIGH ROAD WEST, N17

The Chair noted that a number of late objections and late information had been received in relation to this application and was set out in the Addendum to the report which had been published online and was available at the meeting.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability noted that there was a significant quantity of late information and it had not been possible to consider all of the information in advance of the meeting. It was explained that the Council had obtained legal advice regarding the late objections. Officers had been advised that there was a need to ensure the Council addressed the points raised in the late objections and that the Committee had time to give proper consideration to those points and officer advice before taking its decision regarding this agenda item. It was added that it was an important principle that objections received by the Council were given proper consideration as part of the decision making process to ensure fairness, which was not possible with the number of late objections and late information. As a result, it was highlighted that the officer recommendation was amended to recommend that the decision was deferred to allow full consideration of the late information.

The Chair noted that, due to these exceptional circumstances, she would like to propose that consideration of the application was deferred to June 2022 so that there could be proper consideration of the late and new information submitted in relation to the application. The motion was seconded by Cllr Barbara Blake.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison enquired whether a deferral would be necessary and expressed concern that a deferral in these circumstances would create a precedent for future applications. It was explained that officers were now recommending deferral as they wanted to ensure that they could fully address the late applications and that the Committee had all the information required to make a fully informed decision. The Chair added that this was an exceptional situation and that it would not be commonplace for items to be deferred solely where there was late information.

With 9 votes for, 0 votes against, and 2 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

To defer the application to June 2022 so that there could be proper consideration of the late and new information submitted in relation to the application.

At 7.10pm, the Committee agreed a brief adjournment to allow attendees to leave if they wished. The meeting resumed at 7.20pm.

8. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The Chair referred to the note on pre-application briefings and this information was noted.

9. PPA/2020/0012 - TANGMERE AND NORTHOLT BLOCKS, STAPLEFORD NORTH BLOCK, ENTERPRISE CENTRE, MEDICAL CENTRE, FORMER MOSELLE SCHOOL AND SURROUNDING PUBLIC REALM AREAS, BROADWATER FARM ESTATE, TOTTENHAM, N17

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the redevelopment of part of the Broadwater Farm Estate including demolition of existing buildings and the erection of buildings of up to nine storeys in height to provide 294 new homes; improvements to the public realm; provision of replacement and new commercial and community space; new landscaping and play space; and provision of an Urban Design Framework for the wider Estate.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Some members noted that the scheme was well designed but enquired about whether there had been a loss of green space. It was commented that the area had some existing areas with a significant amount of hardstanding and it was requested that the proposals did not add to this. The applicant team explained that there would be no loss of open space. It was noted that the design of the park had developed to include more greenery following comments from residents. It was highlighted that the existing site had a number of green spaces that were not well utilised and that the park was designed to be more functional.
- In relation to the design and the connections between blocks, the applicant team noted that lessons had been learned from previous design features and that there would be Secured By Design considerations to minimise potential issues.
- It was enquired whether it was possible to increase the number of family homes. The applicant team explained that the number of family homes had been maximised in the design process. It was highlighted that families did not want accommodation in high rise blocks and so there was a balance between density and maximising family homes. It was noted that the proposal provided good conditions for family homes with lower blocks and access to green space. It was added that there would be 35% family homes which was an increase compared to approximately 13% on existing estates.

- It was enquired how the Nationally Described Space Standards, as referenced in paragraph 7.21 of the report, differed from the previous requirements. The Principal Urban Design Officer explained that nationally prescribed space standards had been introduced approximately four years' ago. It was noted that these standards were slightly better than the previous standards, particularly on storage space.
- It was queried how priority for the homes would operate, particularly for those who had been decanted from the site during building works. The applicant team explained that new homes would be allocated under the New Homes Moves Scheme which prioritised those from Tangmere and Northolt Blocks who had been decanted from the site. It was noted that the next level of priority would go to existing secure council tenants within 250 metres of the estate, then existing residents in the ward, then residents in neighbouring wards.
- It was enquired how community cohesion would be ensured, particularly for those in the old and new blocks. The applicant team noted that there was a wider estate improvement programme which sought to improve the quality of life for residents. It was explained that residents were highly engaged in this process and that work would continue with key stakeholders to consider how to bring the community together.
- It was enquired whether people who had grown up on the estate would have any form of priority for homes. The applicant team noted that this had been discussed with the community but that the scheme did not allow households to be split as there was a significant list on the housing register.
- It was noted that it was not possible for the applicant to develop outside of the site but it was enquired how the design of the proposal would ensure that the final design of the wider area was functional. The applicant team noted that the surrounding streets within the site would be upgraded and the network of streets in the wider area would connect. It was added that there was also an Urban Design Framework for the wider area.
- The Committee noted that it would be important to ensure that green spaces, private gardens, and thoroughfares should be designed to avoid creating divides in the community and to ensure public safety. It was commented that the current strategy was to have spaces open in the day and closed in the evenings and that it may be prudent to consider the routes through the site.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

10. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 6 June 2022 (provisional).

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date