

MINUTES OF THE MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Thursday, 3rd April, 2025, 7:00 - 9:30pm

PRESENT:

**Councillors: Lester Buxton, Sean O'Donovan, Barbara Blake (Chair),
Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Cathy Brennan and Emine Ibrahim**

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 were received from Cllr Worrell, Cllr Emery and Cllr Bartlett.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on 2nd March as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2024/2851 COMMUNITY CENTRE, SELBY CENTRE, SELBY ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 8JL

Philip Elliot, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report. This scheme sought planning permission for demolition of all existing buildings comprising Selby Centre and the erection of four buildings. New buildings of 4 to 6 storeys to comprise of

residential accommodation (Use Class C3); and commercial accommodation (Use Class E (a), (b), & (g)). With car and cycle parking; new vehicle, pedestrian, and cycle routes; new public, communal, and private amenity space and landscaping; and all associated plant and servicing infrastructure.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- On the decentralised energy network, there was still a planning policy requirement in the London Plan and in the Local Plan to connect to a heat network to meet low carbon requirements.
- In terms of garden waste, officers had notified the applicant that extra space should be made available so that if people wanted to use the 'paid for waste collection service' they could do so.
- Sprinklers were not an absolute requirement, especially given the height of the buildings.
- There were conditions attached to make sure that the new Selby Centre, would be built and operational so that the Selby Trust, who is a partner for the development, could move into the new premises prior to any work taking place on the Haringey side and demolition works on the existing Selby Centre site. There would therefore be a continuation of service provision,, albeit within a new building of higher b quality.
- The new Selby Centre is in Ball Lane playing fields, in LB Enfield's jurisdiction. A planning application had been made to Enfield Council and has received resolution to grant from their Planning Committee. Conditions attached to the planning permission would mean that that building has to be constructed and operational before works commence on the existing Selby Centre building to build the new housing proposed.
- The reason for the delay from QRP to submission was because of the deliverability of the scheme. The scheme became undeliverable because of the funding and so there was a process of trying to make changes to the scheme and find different funding sources.
- The facility would be owned by Haringey Council, and they are proposing a long-term lease under the social value leasing policy with the Selby Trust.
- There had been discussions on this site for several years regarding the transport strategy. The transport consultant had measured the distance to the nearest station and this calculation was agreed by the Council.
- In regard to tenure and social mix, generally mixed tenure is expected in national and local planning policy. However, there are also requirements to meet housing need and that was best met through social rent homes, as evidenced in the national planning policy framework and Haringey strategic housing market assessment.
- In terms of lack of funding, that was related to the Sports Hall facility. The applicant was looking to raise funds for the housing elements of the site, looking at a mix of funding opportunities with governing bodies and with the Selby Trust fund raising themselves.
- It would be difficult to provide car parking for this scale of development because the local highway network would be put under considerable pressure. In this case, it would

be similar to a lot of Council housing schemes approved recently, which were car free in line with policy.

Cabinet Member Ruth Gordon attended the committee and spoke in support of the application:

The aspiration from the very inception was that there would be a village of different amenities where people could come together. There would be a local school, workspace and sports facilities. The addition of the 200 homes in this scheme would be vital for reducing costs, but also for making sure that those 200 families get not only a roof over the heads, but a home that has got all of the environmental credentials as well.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendation as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous decision.

RESOLVED

2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning & Building Standards is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatics subject to the signing of an agreement in the form of a Director's Letter providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning & Building Standards to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions and informatics as set out in this report provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

2.3 That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 30th May 2025 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning & Building Standards shall in their sole discretion allow; and

2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

2.5 Planning obligations are usually secured through a s106 legal agreement. In this instance the Council is the landowner of the site and is also the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and so cannot legally provide enforceable planning obligations to itself.

2.6 Several obligations which would ordinarily be secured through a S106 legal agreement would instead be imposed as conditions on the planning permission for the proposed development.

2.7 It is recognised that the Council cannot commence to enforce against itself in respect of breaches of planning conditions and so prior to issuing any planning permission, measures would be agreed between the Council's Housing and Regeneration services and the Planning service, including the resolution of noncompliance with planning conditions by the Chief Executive and the reporting of breaches to portfolio holders, to ensure compliance with any conditions imposed

on the planning permission for the proposed development

2.8 The Council cannot impose conditions on a planning permission requiring the payment of monies and so the Director of Placemaking and Housing or successor shall confirm in writing (through a 'Director's Letter') that the payment of contributions for the matters set out below shall be made to the relevant departments at an agreed time.

2.9 The Director's letter would secure obligations that would ordinarily be secured through agreements under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and s278 and s38 of the Highways Act 1980.

Summary of the heads of terms for the development are summarised below, with more detail on obligations provided in the report:

- ☐ Affordable housing – 202 affordable council homes let at low-cost social rents
- ☐ Parking permit restrictions (Residents of the development shall be prevented from obtaining on-street car parking permits)
- ☐ Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments (£4,000)
- ☐ Travel plan monitoring (£15,000)
- ☐ Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) review and amendments
- ☐ Car club contributions
- ☐ Off-site highway works and highway improvements
- ☐ Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit to be completed during the design stage of the above works
- ☐ Monitoring of construction works (£15,000)
- ☐ Carbon offsetting contribution to be agreed prior to implementation (recalculated at £2,850 per tCO₂ at the Energy Plan and Sustainability stages)
- ☐ Connection to District Energy Network (DEN) and backup/alternative solution with deferred offset contribution if DEN not implemented
- ☐ Employment and Skills plan and measures to reflect Employment and Skills requests
- ☐ Employment and Skills management and apprenticeship support contributions
- ☐ Obligations monitoring payment calculated in accordance with the monitoring fee requirements of the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as well as a reasonable financial contribution for monitoring Biodiversity Net Gain

9. HGY/2024/1456 30-48 LAWRENCE ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15 4EG

Gareth Prosser, Deputy Team Leader, introduced the report. This scheme sought planning permission for alterations and extension to existing building (Class E) and erection of residential building (Class C3- Dwellinghouses) including ground floor commercial (Class E - Commercial, Business and Service), cycle and car parking, hard and soft landscaping, and all other associated works.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- There would be green roofs within the development. In addition, the scheme would provide ten additional trees. Most of the green spaces would be at roof and podium level, and on the top of the commercial element as well. There would be over a 400% biodiversity net gain, because there is virtually no greenery on the site at the minute.
- The proposal to provide an additional floor to the roof of the commercial unit was discussed at the Quality Review Panel meeting, and the design of the original proposal

was set back. In terms of the BRE assessment - overshadowing and lighting conditions to rear gardens and to rear windows, the impact was considered acceptable.

Matt Lawrenson, a local resident, attended the committee and spoke in objection of the proposal:

This development would take place metres away from his home. The intense noise, dust and disruption from the construction over two or three years would not only affect his ability to work but would also affect his mental health and well-being. Further, he felt the daylight report included in the application did not consider the personal experiences of the residents and the true impact on their homes, as no consultation was carried out by the applicant with them.

The following was noted in response to questions to the objector:

- Since the deadline the objector had spoken to neighbours who did not know this development was taking place, in his view more people would have objected if they knew about the plans.
- Officers explained that they had notified over 800 people about the site by way of letter, and that site notices were also put up on Lawrence Rd and Collingwood Road. The council held a Development Management Forum inviting the local community to consider and feed back on the proposals. There had been numerous opportunities to engage with both the officers and with the developers.
- To clarify, it would be mainly deck access at the back of the residential scheme and this would be access to the new homes. The homes would be orientated towards Lawrence Rd at the back of the building, which would face Collingwood Rd but also there would be a substantial distance from the new residential properties to Collingwood Rd.
- There would be a visual impact to residents as they would be able to see the extension and the residential building, but that would be set back a substantial distance. In terms of the studies that officers received and considered the scheme complied with BRE guidelines.
- It would be standard to apply limitations on the hours of work, officers had recommended a condition on limiting the hours of operation. There would be a construction management plan which would be assessed and would look at the ways materials, for example, would be brought to the site.

The applicant, Sam Hein, addressed the committee in support of the proposal:

- This proposal would rejuvenate the site and provide modern flexible commercial floor space that met local small business needs. It would deliver 56 quality homes, both affordable and private. The final design had benefited from three rounds of examination by the Quality Review Panel. They have also been conscious of neighbours and undertaken direct public consultation events, including two public exhibitions and a Development Forum. Many of the closest neighbours were actually supportive of the regeneration proposals because it removed the existing operator that generated a lot of noise and odour. The design was climate conscious and would help meet aspirations to go green. This included air source heat pumps, solar panels and rainwater harvesting, and would deliver carbon savings to help go above standards and help keep bills down, the scheme would also be car free.

The following was noted in response to questions to the applicant:

- The applicant actively engaged with registered providers. They have a company called DS2 whose job was to place affordable housing with registered providers. The applicant had made sure by talking to those organisations that they would take on affordable housing and they had been to see the Council's property department as well. The Council sometimes took affordable homes as well and they had come to the same conclusion as them, which is that the number of affordable homes would be too low. But there was a prospect for the shared ownership, and that was probably the best solution for everybody.
- An alternative would be three social rented homes and one shared ownership. But the point is that it was not possible to deliver.
- Through the construction management plan, it was demonstrated how this development could be built with minimum disturbance to neighbours. The main bulk of the building that would take place would be some distance away from the objector's and neighbouring property, therefore there should not be so much disruption.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous decision.

RESOLVED

That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning & Building Standards to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out below and the completion of an agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Standards that secures the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Director Planning & Building Standards to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended measures 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.

2.3 That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 31st May 2025 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Standards shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and

2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

2.9 Summary of the planning obligations for the development is provided below:

1. Carbon offset contribution:

- Estimated carbon offset contribution of £36,480 (indicative), plus a 10% management fee; carbon offset contribution to be re-calculated at £2,850 per

tCO2 at the Energy Plan and Sustainability stages;

- 'Be Seen' commitment to upload energy performance data;
- Energy Plan; and
- Sustainability Review.

2. Car-Free Agreement including a £4,000 contribution to amend the Traffic Management Order.

3. Car Club Membership Subsidies at £100 (one hundred pounds in credit) per year/per unit for the first 2 years.

4. Commercial Travel Plan including £2,000 per year per Travel Plan for monitoring of the travel plan for a period of 5 years.

5. Residential Travel Plans including a £15,000 to monitoring of the travel plan initiatives.

6. Highway Improvements

7. Employment Initiatives - participation and financial contribution towards Local training and Employment Plan.

- Apprenticeship support fees of £1,500;

- Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs;

- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees;

- Submission of an employment and skills plan;

- No less than 20% of local labour. Residents shall be employed for a minimum of 26 weeks; and

- One full time apprenticeship per £3mill of development cost (up to max. 10% of total construction workforce).

8. Monitoring Contribution

- 5% of total value contribution (not including monitoring);

- £500 per non-financial contribution; and

- Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000.

9. Construction Management Travel Plan obligation for £15,000.

10. Retention of Architect

10. HGY/2024/3240 103-107 NORTH HILL N6 4DP

Valerie Okeiyi, Principal Planning Officer introduced the item for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a new care home and rehabilitation clinic (Class C2 - Residential Institution) fronting View Road and including up to 50 beds, hydro pool, salon, foyer/central hub, gym/physio room, lounge and dining rooms and consulting rooms, together with a new residential building (Class C3 - Dwelling Houses) fronting North Hill providing 9 flats (5 x 1 bed, 3 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed), car and cycle parking, refuse/recycling storage, mechanical and electrical plant, hard and soft landscaping, perimeter treatment and associated works.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- Cycle parking usage was aimed at staff and in place as per London plan proposals.
- There would be Community infrastructure levy adding up to over £90,000.
- Hard and soft landscaping proposals relate to both the care home and residential dwellings. The purpose of this condition is to ensure the development maintains an openness and sufficient amenity/green space. The wording doesn't expect that the garden would be retained exactly, there would be changes in terms of the landscaping itself.

- 9 residential dwellings would be market dwellings, the communal garden is for future occupants of these homes.
- There are three conditions relating to designing out crime.

The Chair asked Catherine Smyth, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be approved following a unanimous decision.

RESOLVED

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligation set out in the Heads of Terms below.

2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning & Building Standards is authorised 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 SubCommittee.

2.3 That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 30 April 2025 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Director Planning & Building Standards shall in her/his sole discretion allow; and

2.4 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Detailed Drawings and External Materials
4. Boundary treatment
5. Hard and Soft Landscaping
6. External Lighting
7. Site levels
8. Secure by Design Accreditation
9. Secure by Design Certification
10. Secure by Design Accreditation at the final fitting stage
11. Contaminated Land
12. Unexpected Contamination
13. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM)
14. Air Quality and Dust Management Plan (AQDMP)
15. Considerate Constructors Scheme
16. Energy Statement
17. BREEAM
18. Living roofs
19. Whole Life Cycle Carbon Emission

- 20. Biodiversity Net Gain Plan
- 21. Urban Greening Factor
- 22. Overheating Report
- 23. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- 24. Demolition and Construction Management Plan
- 25. Cycle parking
- 26. Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP)
- 27. Active and Passive EV Charging
- 28. Wheelchair accessible car parking
- 29. Car Parking Management Plan
- 30. Satellite dish/television antenna
- 31. Extract flues/fans
- 32. Care Home – C2 Use restriction
- 33. Telecommunications infrastructure
- 34. Fire safety
- 35. Noise from Plant/Equipment
- 36. Legacy of Mary Feilding
- 37. Air Quality Neutral

11. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

12. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was **xxx**.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date

