

# **MINUTES OF THE Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Thursday, 5th March, 2026, 7:00 – 9:45pm**

## **PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Sean O'Donovan, Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice,  
John Bevan (Vice-Chair), Cathy Brennan, Scott Emery, Alexandra Worrell  
and Amin**

### **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**

Cllr Bartlett, Cllr Ibrahim and Cllr Collett were absent.

### **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 5<sup>th</sup> February as a correct record.

It was requested, that for future committee reports on housing schemes, the number of homes with kitchen-diners and the number with separate kitchens be set out.

### **7. HGY/2025/3156 2 TO 240 BLOCK, TIVERTON ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N15**

Sarah Madondo, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report for demolition and redevelopment to provide 17 council homes arranged across two 4-storey blocks; together with associated communal amenity space, private outdoor space, landscaping, cycle parking, and refuse storage

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

- Members were informed that there had been several notable successes arising from the apprenticeship opportunities created through the Council's Housing development programme. Officers reported that some apprentices had achieved wider recognition, including one who had recently accompanied his employer to the House of Commons to receive a commendation from the Member of Parliament for Tottenham.
- Members were advised that officers had held discussions with the applicant following the Committee's site visit the previous week and that the concerns raised by Members around neglected open space were shared by officers. As a result of those discussions, it was proposed that, as part of the significant contribution the scheme was expected to make towards wider public realm improvements in the area, a specific sum— to be confirmed through the Director's Letter— be allocated to the enhancement of the open space., a
- Officers noted that Members had frequently sought assurances regarding the condition of the estate once construction activity had concluded. It was therefore proposed that the contractor appointed to deliver the new homes would be made responsible for the maintenance, upgrading and general upkeep of the remaining areas for a minimum period of two years following completion of the block. This represented the maximum period available under the council's contractual powers as developer. It was acknowledged that the council could choose to extend this period, and officers expressed the intention to explore this further through the Director's Letter to ensure that the upkeep and maintenance of the area met the concerns regularly raised by Members.
- It was noted that the Strategic Asset Management Team were undertaking a review of all council owned holdings. Housing Officers reported that they were working closely with that team to identify opportunities to improve or repurpose assets. Where appropriate, such assets could either support the ongoing housing programme or be adapted to contribute more effectively to the wider public realm in areas where new developments were being completed. Members were advised that this was an ongoing programme of work, with the Property and Asset Management Team continuing to collaborate closely with Housing officers to progress these opportunities.
- It was reported that solar panels were proposed for installation on both roofs. They would occupy a total area of 92 square metres and were estimated to generate approximately 8,000 kilowatt hours per year. The energy produced was intended primarily to serve the landlord supply. Members were advised that the roof layout remained indicative at this stage and would be subject to further detailed design work.. The system was expected to provide a total peak output of 19 kilowatts.
- The Courtyard would be open during the day, with the gate locked via an automated system at night.
- The 'Neighbourhood Moves Scheme' would be available to future residents of this development.
- In assessing the loss of open space the usage of the space was important to consider; and a value judgement that had been assigned to indicate whether it had a high or low amenity value.
- The site would retain the existing car parking spaces;, new residents could not apply for permits apart from those with disabilities.

- The applicant confirmed that the design of the improved open space would be developed to prevent it from functioning as an unmanaged or neglected area. Secondly, it was noted that the Council could make use of powers outside of the planning system to ensure compliance with rules governing the disposal of waste. Officers advised that these matters would be referred to colleagues in the relevant departments to ensure that they formed part of the overall management approach for the improved space.
- Work was reported to be under way to bring all council estates within the traffic management regime enforced by the Highways Department. Officers advised that they would liaise with colleagues in Highways to explore whether this estate could be prioritised as part of the forthcoming trial. Under the proposed arrangements, civil enforcement officers would be able to undertake parking enforcement on council estates. This was not currently possible due to earlier legislative changes that had removed the authority for enforcement agents to pursue Penalty Charge Notices issued on estate land. Members were informed that the new regime was expected to be implemented later in the current calendar year and into the next, and that efforts would be made to fast-track this estate within that programme. The Committee noted that the revised arrangements would provide the Council with greater powers to issue parking penalties and improve overall control of parking on its estates.
- The applicant advised that one of the benefits of having contractors on site was their proactive approach to addressing graffiti. Contractors routinely removed graffiti and applied anti-graffiti coatings. It was acknowledged that the term “anti-graffiti paint” was something of a misnomer, as graffiti could be applied to almost any surface, but such measures nevertheless provided a degree of deterrence. It was further noted that increased activity on site, together with a strengthened sense of pride in the local environment and the development of a mixed and sustainable community, was expected to discourage antisocial behaviour. The presence of an active and engaged community was considered likely to reduce the inclination of individuals to behave inappropriately due to the potential disapproval of neighbours and peers. While such outcomes could not be guaranteed, the applicant confirmed that every effort had been made to mitigate these issues through high quality design and close liaison across relevant council services to support effective long term management.
- The Housing Officers advised that they would take the Committee’s query with regard to the use of the church back to discuss with colleagues and advise the Committee accordingly.

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 vote of 8 in favour, 0 abstentions and 0 objections.

## **RESOLVED**

2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Director of Planning and Building Standards is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to the signing of an agreement 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 or the Director of Planning and Building Standards 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.

2.3 That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 4th June 2026 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Director of Planning and 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 and informatives.

#### Conditions/Informative Summary

(The full text of recommended conditions/informative is contained in Appendix 1 of the report.)

#### Conditions

1. Time Limit (Compliance)
2. Approved plans and Documents (Compliance)
3. Materials and Detailed Design (Prior to commencement of above ground works)
4. Boundary Treatment and Access control (Pre-occupation)
5. Landscaping (Pre-occupation)
6. Biodiversity Net Gain Plan (Pre-occupation)
7. BNG Monitoring (Pre-occupation)
8. Urban Greening Factor (Pre-completion)
9. Energy Strategy (Prior to above ground works)
10. Overheating Strategy (Prior to above ground works)
11. Energy Monitoring: Be Seen (Prior to completion)
12. Sustainability Review (Prior to occupation)

#### Planning Sub-Committee Report

13. Servicing and Delivery Management Plan (Prior to commencement)
14. Cycle Parking (Prior to occupation)
15. Wheelchair Accessible Car Parking (Pre-occupation)
16. Land Contamination (Pre-commencement)
17. Unexpected Contamination (If identified)
18. Air Quality Assessment (Compliance)
19. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) (Pre-commencement)
20. Management and Control of Dust (Pre-commencement)
21. Considerate Constructors (Pre-commencement)
22. Thames Water Piling Method Statement (Pre-commencement)
23. Surface Water Drainage (Pre-commencement)
24. SuDS Management and Maintenance (Prior to occupation)
25. Water/Recycling Storage (Prior to occupation)
26. Secured by Design Accreditation (Pre above ground works)

27. Secured by Design Certification (Pre occupation)
28. Tree (Compliance)
29. Wheelchair Accessible homes (Compliance)
30. C3 Use Class (Compliance)
31. Transport for London Infrastructure (Prior to above ground works)
32. Play equipment (Pre-commencement/prior to occupation)
33. Antenna (Compliance/prior to occupation)
34. Noise from building service plans and vents (Compliance)
35. Lighting (Pre-occupation)
36. Landscape and Public Realm (Pre-occupation)
37. Accessible homes (Pre-occupation)

#### Informatives

- 1) NPPF
- 2) Director's Letter
- 3) CIL
- 4) Hours of Construction Works
- 5) Party Wall Act
- 6) Street Numbering
- 7) London Fire Brigade
- 8) Thames Water -Water Pressure
- 9) Thames Water - Groundwater
- 10) Thames Water -Water consumption
- 11) Thames Water - Infrastructure
- 12) Metropolitan Police Service Designing Out Crime
- 13) Pollution

#### **8. HGY/2025/3180 30-48 LAWRENCE ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15 4EG**

Gareth Prosser, Deputy Team Leader, introduced the report for alterations and a 7-storey extension (facing Lawrence Road) to existing building to provide new self-storage facility (Use Class B8), new flexible workspace / incubator units and other works ancillary to the development.

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

- The 'shed' was to be retained because it was reusable, and therefore there was no need to demolish it. Incorporating the existing building rather than demolishing and rebuilding was considered more sustainable and practical. It served its purpose effectively and was incorporated into the development. As there was no change to this structure, there was no additional amenity impact on the properties to the rear, which was regarded as a significant benefit. The existing situation for residents within the conservation area therefore would not materially change.
- There was expected to be a modest uplift in biodiversity net gain. The site is of poor ecological quality, being largely covered in concrete. Any additional landscaping would therefore have a meaningful positive impact. The existing trees on site would be retained, and new landscaping was proposed at the front of the development. The building was set slightly back from the building line of number 28, allowing for flower beds, planting, and wildflowers at the frontage. A biodiverse green roof was proposed on top of the

- main building, adding significantly to the overall greenery. A small, landscaped space was also proposed at the rear, which had been conditioned to ensure clarity on its final design.
- The proposed building comprised two main elements: the retained industrial warehouse to the rear and a new-build element to the front, designed in a contemporary Art Deco warehouse style. The principal accommodation would consist of self-storage units, each forming an individual secure space allocated to a specific customer. The front-facing element would comprise light industrial units suitable for small scale industrial uses compatible with nearby residential and commercial occupiers. These units, like the self storage spaces, would be let by the developer.
  - The developer would be owner-occupier and would construct, operate, and maintain the building. They intend to manage the letting of both the self-storage units and the small business incubator units directly.
  - The peak trip generation was forecasted at five vehicles in/out at any one time. Lawrence Road is lightly trafficked and predominantly residential, especially compared with its previous industrial use. We have no concerns from a transport or highways perspective regarding trip generation or parking demand.
  - Fab Labs (Fabrication Laboratories) were designed to be flexible, small, and cost effective. The applicant advised that they operates six similar stores in comparable residential areas. Typical occupants lived within a 20–30 minute walking distance, often even closer.
  - The working day for the development was 09:00 to 18:00. Extended hours were available to customers from 06:00 to 23:00; however, only around 15% of existing customers across the applicant's other stores opted for these extended hours.
  - Given the nature and scale of the building, the GLA policy has been met and, beyond this, fire safety matters were to be addressed through Building Regulations.

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 vote of 8 in favour, 0 abstentions and 0 objections.

## **RESOLVED**

2.1 That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning and Building Standards to GRANT planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out below and the completion of a legal agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the Director of Planning and 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 of Planning and 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 2026 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management & Planning Enforcement or the 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.

Summary of Conditions (the full text of the recommended conditions can be found in Appendix 1 of this report).

#### Conditions

- 1) Time Limit
- 2) Approved Plans
- 3) Materials and design detail
- 4) Energy Strategy
- 5) Overheating
- 6) BREEAM certificate
- 7) Living roofs
- 8) Servicing and Delivery Plan and Waste Management Plan
- 9) Cycle Parking (Long and short-stay self-storage and Fab Lab)
- 10) Car Parking Management Plan
- 11) Demolition and Construction Management Plan (Transport)
- 12) Blue Badge Parking
- 13) Unexpected Contamination (Pollution)
- 14) NRMM (Pollution)
- 15) Management and Control of Dust
- 16) Considerate Constructors Scheme
- 17) Secured by Design – Accreditation
- 18) Secured by Design – Certification
- 19) Trees
- 20) Landscaping
- 21) Surface Water Drainage
- 22) Gates
- 23) Noise
- 24) Architect Retention
- 25) Hours of Operation

#### Informatives

- 1) NPPF
- 2) CIL
- 3) Hours of Construction Work
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street numbering
- 6) Thames Water

- 7) Pollution
- 8) Secured by Design

**9. PPA/2025/0021 LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS BETWEEN HORNSEY PARK ROAD, MAYES ROAD, COBURG ROAD, WESTERN ROAD AND THE KINGS CROSS / EAST COAST MAINLINE, CLARENDON GAS WORKS, OLYMPIA TRADING ESTATE AND 57-89 WESTERN ROAD LONDON N8 & N22**

Valerie Okeiyi, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report for pre-application proposals for Phase 5 - Reserved Matters seeking approval of appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and access in relation to Buildings F01, G01, G02, J01 and J02. Use of Sustainabrick building façade facing material on Phases 4 and 5.

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

- The Sustainabrick system had a design life of 60 years, equivalent to that of a conventional wall. It met all relevant building regulations. The foundations did not need to be as large or as deep, resulting in reduced concrete use and improved sustainability. It was also more cost effective.
- Regarding affordable housing provision, this had been established within the wider masterplan several years earlier. The pre-applicant advised that they had delivered the level of affordable housing they were obligated to provide, and in some cases more than required. Recent economic challenges had not adversely affected the scheme; the developers had continued to progress the project and had found ways to withstand current market pressures while still delivering the affordable housing commitments made years ago. This was considered a positive outcome.
- In terms of height, the pre-applicant team stated that at their Kidbrooke development they were delivering a 22-storey building. The tallest building in Phase Five would not use Sustainabrick but instead an aluminium system developed, following review by QRP. They were also exploring the delivery of 26-storey high buildings in Greenwich.
- On the issue of adhesion, it was acknowledged by the pre-applicant that there had been failures in the past. The team had reviewed various slip systems, including mechanically fixed systems and adhesive-based systems, the latter of which had historically experienced issues. They had spent three and a half years undertaking research and development with Monolith, the manufacturer. The proposed system addressed potential failure by embedding the slips in a mesh, which would then be adhered to a waterproof Sto render. Behind this would sit approximately 20mm of additional waterproof render, followed by a further waterproof sheet, insulation of varying thicknesses, and finally the SFS (structural façade system).
- From a sustainability perspective Officers advised that brick production methods significantly influenced embodied carbon. Alternative drying methods could reduce this impact, and using only part of a conventional brick also lowered embodied carbon. Reducing façade weight further decreased the embodied carbon required for the superstructure. These principles were supported in general.
- However, questions remained regarding the sourcing of raw materials, including transport distances, which formed part of the broader sustainability assessment. Mortar use was also raised as an issue: traditional lime mortars

allowed bricks to be dismantled and reused, whereas conventional cement mortars did not. It was noted that the proposed system did not appear to allow for deconstruction in this way.

- The pre-applicant reported having four projects across their portfolio at various stages of Gateway 2 approval. The scheme closest to receiving consent, which also proposed this product, was at Royal Arsenal Riverside. The regulator's concerns had not related specifically to the product but to structural engineering matters. Determination times were inconsistent, and no applications had yet been processed within the statutory 12-week period.
- QRP responses, and the applicant's response to their comments, would be included within the committee report on the Phase 5 application, once ready for consideration by PSC Members.
- The pre-applicant advised that exploring alternative construction systems helped maintain the overall viability of the scheme. This avoided the need to reduce build quality or affordable housing provision. Although the system was not substantially cheaper than conventional brickwork, it contributed to making the wider scheme financially deliverable. Pricing would still need to reflect market conditions, but the priority remained delivering the committed levels of affordable housing.
- The pre-applicant stated that the 60-year design life referred to the specification of individual building components, rather than the lifespan of the building itself. While components were rated for 60 years in line with manufacturer and warranty requirements, the building was expected to last significantly longer—potentially hundreds of years.

## **10. 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.

## **11. 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.

## **12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no new items of urgent business.

## **13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was to be confirmed.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....