

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 21ST JULY, 2022, 7.00 - 8.07 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Barbara Blake (Chair), Councillor Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Councillor Nicola Bartlett, Councillor John Bevan, Councillor Lester Buxton, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim, Councillor Ajda Ovat, Councillor Matt White, and Councillor Alexandra Worrell.

In attendance: Councillor Ibrahim Ali, Bruce Castle ward, and Councillor Dana Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning.

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 Councillors George Dunstall and Yvonne Say. Councillor Emine Ibrahim was present as substitute.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 8, HGY/2021/3175 – High Road West, London, N17, Cllr Ibrahim stated that she had a personal interest. As one of the objectors for the item was Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, Cllr Ibrahim noted that she was an Arsenal supporter and a member of AISA (Arsenal Independent Supporters' Association). She stated that she considered this non-prejudicial and would therefore take part in the discussion and voting, would be considering the item with an open mind, and would take all material planning considerations into account.

In relation to item 8, HGY/2021/3175 – High Road West, London, N17, Cllr Bevan noted that he had received tickets to the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium for a Guns N' Roses concert (although these had been donated). Cllr Bevan also noted that he was a member of the Spurs Resident Consultative Group. Cllr Bevan considered this to be a non-prejudicial personal interest and therefore confirmed that he would take part in

the discussion and voting, would be considering the item with an open mind, and would take all of the material planning considerations into account.

6. MINUTES

It was noted that the minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee held on 6 June 2022 would be considered at a future meeting.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2021/3175 - HIGH ROAD WEST, LONDON, N17

The Sub-Committee considered an application for a hybrid planning application seeking permission for 1) Outline component comprising demolition of existing buildings and creation of new mixed-use development including residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business & service (Use Class E), business (Use Class B2 and B8), leisure (Use Class E), community uses (Use Class F1/F2), and Sui Generis uses together with creation of new public square, park & associated access, parking, and public realm works with matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping, and access within the site reserved for subsequent approval; and 2) Detailed component comprising Plot A including demolition of existing buildings and creation of new residential floorspace (Use Class C3) together with landscaping, parking, and other associated works (EIA development – ES viewable on Council website & at The Grange N17).

Mr Philip Elliott, Planning Officer, presented the item. In response to questions from Members, Mr Elliott informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Additional objections had been received from Tottenham Hotspur FC, the Metropolitan Police Service Security Advisor, and other interested parties.
- There were some clarifications and corrections which were set out in full in the addendum. He note that there was an error on page 66 of the agenda papers In table X Line 2 should read social rent with 1730 hab rooms, 23.6%; and line 3 should read shared ownership with 1164 hab rooms, 15.9%.
- Tottenham Hotspur had also submitted objections regarding crowd flow. The Council's independent crowd flow adviser had considered the issues and felt that they had already been addressed.
- The Metropolitan Police Service Security Advisor had clarified that they had no objection per se to the proposed development but highlighted the need for the crowd flow arrangements to be shared with Tottenham Hotspur, the British Transport Police, and emergency services for comment.
- The calculation of 240 full-time posts had been derived from a provision of 392 minimum jobs based on the minimum floor space provision in the lowest employment generating uses.

- The business relocation strategy would not result in job losses in the majority of cases as they would be reallocated elsewhere.
- There was a package of design work for the reserved matters that would be subject to further assessments from both officers and members. The aim of this would be to maximise the number of multiple aspect units. In some cases, this would not be possible due to contextual constraints.
- Where single aspect units were proposed, they tended to be in areas where there would be a better outlook on parks and open spaces. The range of floorspace and flexibility had been requested to allow the developer to respond to market needs.
- The Sub-Committee was recommended to grant permission regarding the range of floorspace set out in the report.
- There would be a potential net increase in jobs.
- There was an existing health facility on site and a planning obligation to re-provide that floorspace.
- There was an obligation to meet any uplift in healthcare demand. There was existing planning permission for a health facility at Tottenham Hotspur. If this did not come to fruition, then applicant still had the obligation to provide sufficient floorspace to meet the uplift in need.
- The definition of the word 'vicinity', as stated in the report, could be something that could be made clearer when the section 106 was drafted.
- The environmental impact assessment required modelling of the worst-case scenarios. Although it was possible to maximise commercial floorspace and reduce units, there were a number of scenarios and it was not possible to consider them all.
- The Council owned the land south of White Hart Lane towards the Love Lane estate, the local library and the community centre nearby. The 500 social homes would be in that area of the land; it was approximately 2.8 hectares.
- The document submitted by Tottenham Hotspur was considered to be an unlikely hypothesis, partly due to the parameters, control documents and planning policies that the applicant/developer would have to adhere to.
- Reserved matters would be brought back for the consideration of the Sub-Committee.
- In terms of engagement with businesses, extensive engagement and consultation had been carried out.
- The standard obligation was to have 20% of construction-based employment opportunities for local people. This would be part of the section 106 agreement. Work would be done with the economic development team to connect local jobs with local people.
- The comments made on paragraph 4.22 of the report partly referred to a worst-case scenario. Page 499 of the agenda papers set out conditions and set out what the reserved matters application should include, such as a planning compliance report.
- Although it was reasonable to raise questions regarding how housing units would be considered against commercial units and other amenities, it was important to note that there were policies in place to ensure that the requirements were met for an application that took a comprehensive approach. It was noted that the applicant was required to adhere to policy but that they could not be solely responsible for areas that they did not directly control. The applicant would be required to ensure access to certain amenities in the area, including nursery floorspace, an area to

congregate with other members of the community, and complimentary leisure uses.

- The applicant needed to meet the requirements of the development plan, planning policy, and other requirements.
- The figures of 2612 referred to the illustrative scheme regarding affordable housing , 2869, related to maximum homes for EIA purposes without Plot A and 2929 is max including Plot A. The max parameters could not be delivered due to the limitations within the other control documents
- The redacted compensation costs related to the possible costs of compulsory purchase orders to secure homes that the applicant did not currently own.

The Sub-Committee then heard from those objecting to the application.

Mr Paul Burnham, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He did not believe that the public benefits being discussed as part of the application would be delivered as the economic focus was based on cross subsidising new Council homes in Love Lane with market sales in the north of the area. This area was owned by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club and a large plot of the land was a public park. It was suggested that the applicant would be left with little to be able to subsidise the development in the south of the area.
- He stated that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had not supported the application, had objected to the excessive density of 2900 homes, and wanted a plan that would safeguard quality of life. He asked the Council not to house tenants into homes with low levels of daylight and sunlight.
- Concerns were expressed that 927 single aspect homes, as set out in the illustrative scheme, would mean that external windows faced in only one direction and this was considered to be a key quality-of-life issue.
- It was claimed that the proposals were in breach of the London Housing Design Guide.
- It was noted that the land would be leased to Lendlease and that there was a risk that council tenants would be required to pay significant service charges; it was claimed that the Council would not be able to control this.
- In relation to the ballot at Love Lane in 2021, Paul Burnham stated that not everyone supported demolition in the area. He commented that approximately 75% of voters did not have a secured tenancy and believed that many had voted 'yes' on the ballot in order to get a secured tenancy rather than to support the demolition; it was noted that only 35% of the voters had voted 'yes'.
- It was not considered to be clear whether 360 homes, that had been promised to residents in 10-15 years' time, would be delivered.

Mr Alex Tryfanos resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He was surprised that areas which contained Council homes had become subject to a planning application. He stated that, from the start of the regeneration project, residents had been informed that their homes and businesses would be demolished and felt like they did not belong in the areas in which they lived.
- He stated that private land was being taken away to build a new library and a community centre and suggested that this should be built on the nearby council land. It was added that a previous community centre had been shut by the Council in the 1980s.

- It was commented that residents should be able to remain as part of the Tottenham High Road Community.
- The shops proposed for demolition provided employment for over 60 people, housed 215 families, and had a health centre for over 4,500 residents. It was believed that the overall job loss would be over 690.
- It was stated that these points had been made to the Council many times and the proposed scheme had caused stress and anxiety to residents, negatively impacting their mental and physical health.
- He asked that planning permission was refused.

Mr Richard Serra, representing Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He objected to the application and considered that it was a departure from the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP) and the High Road West masterplan framework, documents that had been produced by the Council after extensive consultation.
- It was stated that, although employment was a key driver of regeneration and impacted quality of life, the scheme would lead to a net loss of 300 jobs. He commented that the scheme was largely residential but had little commitment to community, leisure, or employment use.
- He felt that the homes were poorly designed and noted that the QRP did not support the proposals, stating that it would lead to a poor-quality living environment, excessive height and overdevelopment.
- It was considered that the safe movement of people had not been properly addressed. It was noted that over one million people used White Hart Lane station every year. The Metropolitan Police had objected and continued to object to the application. He claimed that the application was not safe.
- There were a number of concerns that had been raised and it was suggested that, even with £90 million of funding from the Greater London Authority (GLA), the scheme would not be viable. He added the view that a possible public subsidy should not be reason enough to grant an application.
- He considered that the scheme benefits were inadequate and unclear, the harm was unquantified, and the crowd flow safety was unproven.
- He also claimed that, once the application was granted, the Council would not be able to insist on more than the minimum floor spaces permitted or to change the balance of uses in order to provide greater employment, community, or leisure facilities.
- He believed that the scheme was disrespectful to the aspirations of the local community, which had been consulted upon in the AAP, and it said that the application should be refused.

Mr Faruk Tepeyurt, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- He was the former Director of Peacock Industrial Estate and was representing the industrial estate and a small group of traders on the High Road and White Hart Lane.
- Haringey was the fourth most deprived borough in London and the thirteenth in the country. Peacock Industrial Estate had unique business provision in the area where many people owned the freehold units and others were leaseholders. It was noted that income was generated through match day parking.

- The report stated that 85 businesses supported around 690 jobs. He noted that approximately half of those jobs were on the High Road and White Hart Lane and the half were on the Peacock Industrial Estate. He commented that the jobs on the Peacock Industrial Estate were highly skilled jobs and well paid, with most of the jobs above the London living wage. It was added that most of the individuals were self-employed.
- He considered that the proposal would have a significant, negative impact on the estate as it would demolish all 30 units and a total of 85 businesses on the High Road and White Hart Lane. He claimed that, in a pre-application briefing on 25 October 2021, the officer's report said that the loss of industrial land would need to be mitigated by the inclusion of a minimum amount of floorspace but this had not been undertaken.
- He also claimed that, at the Scrutiny Committee on 29 November 2021, it had been noted that the level of industrial space on the new site would be approximately 30% of the space that the Peacock Industrial Estate currently had. He commented that this would no longer be provided. It was added that a protest had been held at a public meeting on 31 January 2019.
- He felt that there had been no engagement with the estate, the businesses, or the High Road.
- He believed that the scheme was racist and discriminatory.

Councillor Ibrahim Ali, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- A number of councillors had been recently elected in May 2022 and he felt that they had not had sufficient time to thoroughly consider the application.
- He asserted that it was not clear how the borders for the designated areas had been determined and considered that there would be an impact on the neighbouring residents outside the designated areas.
- The agenda papers appeared to show the loss of amenity for the existing estates, including parking and storage spaces.
- There were queries regarding the use of access on a small cul-de-sac and concerns about the impact on existing areas which were not part of the application.
- He said that there had been conversations about the application with residents but not with wider stakeholders.
- He understood that the tallest building that was proposed was 29 stories which was higher than anticipated and there were concerns about the impact on areas such as Penhurst Road, Pretoria Road, and other roads.
- He was concerned that there had been little conversation between the CCG and the applicant regarding plans for the Tottenham Health Centre.
- He said that there should be proper compensation and adjustment for residents who were impacted by the application.

In response to questions from members, those objecting to the application stated that:

- In relation to a question about acceptable alternatives for the scheme, Richard Serra claimed that Tottenham Hotspur football club could not dictate the details of the planning application but considered, based on the available analyses, that there were too many units and of insufficient quality.
- In response to a question about claims of racism in the application, Faruk Tepeyurt alleged that Planning Officers had held more than 30 secret meetings with developers and had invited select people to property festivals and had asked for

donations but did not ask members of the community for donations. He stated that people from the Peacock Industrial Estate, who were from minority ethnic groups, owned a third of the land in the area but had not been included in conversations. He also said that, in 2014, the Peacock industrial Estate had been de-zoned from being a protected employment zone following secret meetings. He also believed that the pre-planning application submitted by the Peacock Industrial Estate in 2017 had not been seriously considered by the Council's officers.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability, stated that he would not comment on the allegations that had been made but noted that there was a separation between the local planning authority planning officers, the regeneration service, and the applicant.

In response to further questions from members, those objecting to the application stated that:

- The floorspace relating to the library ranged from 400sqm to 3500sqm. If the scheme was approved, the Sub-Committee would be approving a range of floorspace for that particular building.
- Mr Serra had worked for Tottenham Hotspur for seven years and had been involved in the planning profession for 27 years and he stated that he had never seen an outline application of this scale with so much flexibility. The range of floorspace was approximately ten times the size of the Sainsbury's in Northumberland Park.
- Paul Burnham stated that 309 of the 500 council homes would not be built for approximately 10 to 15 years. It was commented that these homes would be located in the last two plots to be developed and that there could be a number of changes in this time. Concerns were expressed that the community homes and the amenities would not be developed. It was stated that the scheme would result in 2,900 homes which would increase house prices outside of the designated area and force community members out of the area. It was stated that the 100% social rent policy of the Council's housebuilding program was positive but that this did not mean that the application should be granted.
- The Head of Development Management stated that the first phase of the process involved building social rented homes and that the section 106 legal agreement would require a minimum percentage of all homes to be affordable. It was added that each phase would need to include a viability assessment which would be reviewed by the Council.

The Sub-Committee then heard from those supporting the application.

Ms Bilad Dioff, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was the Chair of the Love Lane Residents' Association.
- Her kitchen and the building were in very poor condition.
- Her mother was 80 years old and they lived on the fourth floor; she felt that it was difficult for people with wheelchairs to get around in the building.
- She believed that antisocial behaviour would reduce as a result of the scheme.
- She had visited Elephant Park and she believed that there was space for businesses and an operating High Street. She stated that there was also a library and she felt that most residents approved of the application.

Ms Enid Henry, resident, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She would like the new homes that had been promised ten years ago to be built as soon as possible.
- She wanted to remain in the Love Lane area and was looking forward to the new facilities.
- She wanted her flat to be on the ground floor.

Ms Suzanne Wolfe, Public Voice, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- She was representing three Love Lane residents:
 - Ms Laura Speller was a local resident. She stated that many tenants were suffering from overcrowding and that Ms Speller's mental health had suffered due to the overcrowding. It was noted that Ms Speller's son had autism and that the family would prefer not to move. She stated that the redevelopment would provide 500 new homes and she believed that this was a good opportunity for Ms Speller's family.
 - Ms Emine Aker had lived in temporary accommodation on White Hart Lane for about seven years. Ms Aker claimed that the flat was old and required repairs; the garden was unsafe and the family felt insecure. She believed that the development would result in improvements. She supported the provision of additional green areas and play areas.
 - Miss Grace Lungu was a leaseholder and had lived in Love Lane for 32 years. She wanted the proposals to go ahead as she believed that they would improve her standard of living as the homes in the area were dated. She stated that many of the individuals opposing the application did not live on Love Lane.

Councillor Dana Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning, informed the Sub-Committee that:

- Haringey had a critical shortage of housing, especially affordable housing.
- She stated that many families lived in crowded accommodation which had an effect on people's physical and mental health and on children's performance in school. It was noted that 80 households were overcrowded.
- The application would provide 500 new homes for residents.
- It was commented that the residents from Love Lane suffered from persistent issues, such as leaks, damp and mould, and that there had been over 1,000 repair jobs raised on the estate in the last year. There were 44 homes which were in such bad condition that they could not be let to residents.
- She believed that the proposed homes would be built to a high standard and would also include additional, larger homes that were required. There would be 165 additional two bedroom properties and an additional 106 homes with three bedrooms or more. These homes would be delivered in phase 1 of the scheme, by 2028/29.
- The Cabinet Member stated that, although the application had drawn some controversy, it would provide homes that were needed by the community. A new library and new public square would also be built.
- She added that there was no guarantee that the GLA funding would be available for another plan given the constrained economic circumstances.

The Sub-Committee heard from the applicant team. Ms Bek Seeley, Lendlease, informed the Sub-Committee that the application had been developed over almost 10

years, stemming from the High Road West master plan framework. She stated that the applicant had worked with the community, the Council, and the High Road West scheme to offer residents and businesses new opportunities and to ensure that 500 high quality homes would be delivered early in the scheme. It was commented that the applicant had supported the Tottenham People Priority, assisted local schools, and worked to reinvigorate shop frontages on the High Road. It was stated that further local community opportunities would be made available, including funding for young people, green spaces for families, and new community facilities including a new library and learning centre. The applicant team added that the scheme would provide affordable, modern work spaces for businesses and good quality, new jobs supported by successful employment programs for local people.

The applicant team considered that the scheme would be highly sustainable, minimising carbon energy use and promoting healthy neighbourhoods. It was noted that the applicant was committed to co-design and inclusive engagement throughout the project and there would be walking and cycling improvements.

The applicant understood that the proposals had concerned a number of local businesses. Over the last four years, the applicant had been consulting with them to better understand their needs and how they could be met. It was stated that, with the Council, the applicant was committed to finding the best outcome for each business' individual circumstances. The applicant team believed that the proposed scheme would also result in improvements for local people when there were match or event days at Tottenham Hotspur Football Club as it would provide more space in a large square to accommodate fans more safely.

In response to questions from members, the following responses were provided:

- In response to a question about alternative options, the Legal Advisor stated that the Sub-Committee was required to consider the application that was before it; in particular, whether the application met the requirements of the development plan, having regard to all material considerations. It was added that other, potential applications were not material planning considerations.
- Michelle Letton, Lendlease, stated that it would be more affordable to replace, rather than upgrade, the existing Love Lane Estate. It was suggested that the proposed scheme would provide a range of improvement, including outdoor spaces, play areas, a library, and support for the community. It was added that the GLA grant funding assisted with the viability of the project but that Lendlease would also be making substantial contributions to the project.
- In relation to the library and learning space, Greg Greasley, Lendlease, confirmed that this would be owned by and handed back to the Council.
- Regarding crowd movement in the area, Tom Horne, DP9 planning advisors, stated that the existing streets were not designed for large crowd movement. It was suggested that the designs set out in the proposal would be more functional; it was hoped that this would lead to less antisocial behaviour. It was added that Tottenham Hotspur currently had and would retain responsibility for making good the area through activities such as litter collection.
- In relation to a query about the potential loss of floorspace, Mr Horne stated that the health centre had been marked as a loss but that this was on the basis that the new health centre would be delivered through Tottenham Hotspur's consent, which had already been given. It was highlighted that, if the health centre was not

delivered, then the applicant would be delivering the new health centre. It was also noted that the Grange and the Station Master's House were included in the existing floorspace. Mr Horne stated that there would be no net loss and it was considered that ample community facilities would be provided.

- In response to a question about the requested flexibility, Mr Horne stated that smaller schemes often required less flexibility because they were often delivered quickly and over a shorter period of time, whereas larger schemes generally required larger levels of flexibility because they were delivered over longer periods of time. He added that the level of flexibility requested had been provided before in other schemes and the applicant was comfortable that what was being requested was reasonable. He also noted that there were levels of certainty in the form of maximums and minimums per zone.
- The Head of Development Management noted that, as set out on page 499 of the agenda pack, the Sub-Committee would have some degree of oversight as the uses came forward through reserved matters.
- In relation to a query about the space provided for residents, Mr Horne explained that Moselle Square would be a space for residents for the majority of the time and would have the dual purpose of being a safe open space for match and event days. Lucas Lawrence, SEW Architects, stated that the overall density was considered to be appropriate for the type of development. It was noted that there was also a variety of density within the scheme which aimed to respect historic assets and to adhere to the general principle that the densest areas should be closest to transport hubs.
- Mr Lawrence stated that the play space provision sat across the whole masterplan and was inclusive of children in various age ranges. It was noted that the youngest children had provision in the Podium Garden which was protected, away from public spaces, and that older children would have use of other green spaces. It was added that the proposals were compliant with the policy for play space.
- The Principal Urban Design Officer noted that the scheme had been examined by the QRP several times. At the latest consideration, it was commented that the QRP had been broadly welcoming but had expressed concerns about the deliverability of Peacock Park and the design and height of the second and third highest buildings in Plots B and F. It was noted that half of the park had existing planning permission and that the key concerns related to Plots B and F. It was added that changes had been made to the design code since the last QRP; these included more space on the Podium Garden, more sunlight, and more dual aspect flats in Plot B and positioning the tall building further away from White Hart Lane to reduce the impact on the conservation area and heritage assets in Plot F. It was highlighted that the applicant would be held to these changes and that reserved matters applications would also be considered by the QRP.
- The applicant had the ability to re-examine the number of single aspect homes and their orientation. The final approval on these details will be considered by the Sub-Committee.

At 9:57pm, the Chair stated that, in accordance with Committee Standing Order 18, she would be using her discretion as Chair to continue the meeting and complete the item under consideration.

In response to further questions from members, the following responses were provided:

- The applicant did not own the land but would agree a lease or licence with the Council over time.
- In relation to potential cost escalation, it was stated that the applicant was a construction company as well as a developer and was used to economic cycles over a project lifetime. The applicant would consider the construction and, alongside the contractors, would look at contract forms and types, examine where the goods were coming from, and examine different types of delivery to help speed up delivery and reduce cost.
- There was section 106 commitment for delivering the library, the learning centre, and the homes.
- It was stated that the applicant was committed to ensuring that residents would only be required to move home once. The applicant team highlighted that moving people into new homes whilst major changes were made to an area was a complicated process.

The Committee felt that the phasing plan should take account of the aim to maximise single moves for residents where possible. The Head of Development Management stated that this could be incorporated within proposed condition 3 and that it would be possible to include wording that the applicant would seek to minimise moves for residents as much as possible. It was clarified that it was not recommended to use more stringent wording as this could have unintended consequences which could delay the development.

In response to further questions from members, the following responses were provided:

- The applicant team stated that the application allowed sufficient space to provide for existing businesses on the site.
- The applicant had agreed provision within the draft section 106 to provide incentives and preferential treatment to businesses within the designated areas to stay within the scheme or to move outside the scheme; this was in the form of rent-free periods or capital contributions.
- There was a commitment to try to keep as many of the businesses on site as possible.
- The proposal is found to be an acceptable development and meets the development plan funding, funding is a material consideration that Cllrs should be mindful of but the primary consideration should be whether the application is acceptable.

The Head of Development Management stated that the recommendation was to grant planning permission, as set out in the report and the addendum and subject to the amendment of condition 3 to minimise moves for residents as much as possible.

Following a vote with 7 votes in favour, 1 vote against, and 2 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informative notes subject to referral to the Mayor of London for his consideration at Stage 2

and signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below and a section 278 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below. For clarity, the section 278 Legal Agreement will not be signed prior to the granting of outline planning permission as insufficient detail exists to enable the terms of the agreement to be reached. The section 278 Legal Agreement will be signed prior to commencement of relevant highway works.

2. The section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than the 31st August 2022 or such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director shall in her/his sole discretion allow. Following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1), planning permission is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
3. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director 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 Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions – the full text of recommended conditions was contained in Appendix 14 of the report, **subject to the amendment of condition 3 to minimise moves for residents as much as possible.**

9. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 5 September 2022.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date