

MINUTES OF THE Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Monday, 8th June, 2026, 7:00-8:30pm

PRESENT:

**Councillors: John Bevan (Vice-Chair), Scott Emery (Chair),
Kaushika Amin, Simon Clark, Marc Jenner, Anne Gray, Dana Carlin,
Melanie Gingell and Sue Jameson**

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

Cllr Emery welcomed members of the committee, welcoming back Councillors Bevan, Amin Jameson and Carlin who were previous members of the committee. He noted that through members knowledge and understanding of Haringey, they could truly shape the borough and reflect the needs of the residents that they served.

Cllr Bevan, vice chair of the committee, flagged that he was the design champion for the council and encouraged members to engage with Urban Design Learning and New London Architecture.

2. PLANNING PROTOCOL

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

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Hodges and Cllr Brands.

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 8th March as a correct record.

7. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

It was explained to members, by the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement, that the purpose of pre-application briefings was set out in the Planning Protocol within the Council's Constitution. The main purposes were:

- To enable Members to provide observations that supported high-quality development through the pre-application process and helped avoid potential delays at later stages.
- To enable Members to highlight strategic Council and local planning objectives and requirements set out in planning policy and guidance that were particularly relevant to a proposal.
- To ensure Members were aware of significant schemes prior to their formal consideration by the Planning Sub-Committee.
- To support more informed and effective decision-making when applications were subsequently presented to the Planning Sub-Committee for determination.

8. PRE/2024/0241 7-11 TOTTENHAM LANE, HORNSEY, LONDON, N8 9DJ

Valerie Okeyi, Principal Planning Officer, introduced the report for retention and alteration of the Former Lotus Motor Racing Car Factory, the demolition of all other buildings and structures on site, and the construction of a mixed-use development, comprising Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis), flexible industrial floorspace (Classes E(g)(iii) and B8), and a café / community use (Classes E, F1 and F2), alongside the delivery of a service road, a landscaped public square, public realm improvements and ancillary works.

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

- The applicant advised that car ownership amongst students was expected to be very low. This approach had been developed in consultation with Transport Officers and the Greater London Authority (GLA). No student car ownership was anticipated due to the site's accessibility and public transport connections.
- One parking space was proposed for wheelchair users and accessible drop-off purposes. The applicant stated that residents would generally not be expected to own cars whilst living in the development.
- In relation to affordable housing, the applicant advised that 35% of the 518 purpose-built student accommodation rooms would be provided at affordable rents in accordance with GLA requirements, equating to approximately 181 rooms.
- Members noted that 10% of rooms would be wheelchair accessible whilst only one Blue Badge parking space was proposed. The applicant acknowledged this and advised that the number of accessible parking spaces would be reviewed further as the proposal progressed.
- The applicant advised that all its developments typically included community space at ground-floor level. These spaces were generally made available to community interest companies (CICs) and charities either rent-free or at heavily discounted rates.

- A community organisation had not yet been identified for the space, although discussions with potential operators were ongoing.
- The applicant advised that the space would be available free of charge for community events at certain times, with discounted rental arrangements applying at other times.
- In relation to transport impacts, the applicant confirmed that engagement had taken place with Transport for London (TfL) during the pre-application process and that further discussions would continue as the application progressed.
- The applicant advised that neighbouring buildings on the opposite side of the railway were 14 storeys in height, whereas the proposed development would be 16 storeys, making it two storeys taller.
- Secure cycle storage would be provided to the rear of the workspace area, with separate and secure access arrangements for students.
- The applicant advised that London Plan policy allowed developments retaining industrial capacity on industrial sites to follow the Fast Track Route where 35% affordable housing was provided. The GLA had agreed with the applicant's methodology during pre-application discussions.
- As the proposal would aim to meet the 35% affordable housing threshold, the applicants considered that no viability assessment would be required and the affordable provision would be secured through a Section 106 Agreement.
- The applicant confirmed that calculations relating to industrial capacity included the service yard, which would be reserved solely for industrial users. This approach had been discussed and agreed in principle with the GLA during the pre-application process.
- The applicant advised that a number of design iterations had been undertaken with input from officers and the Quality Review Panel (QRP), resulting in a significant reduction in the perceived massing of the scheme.
- Further subdivision of the building mass had been explored but would have required additional cores and lift infrastructure, increasing the overall bulk and complexity of the development.
- The applicant also stated that splitting the development into additional buildings would increase the wall-to-floor ratio and carbon footprint, making the proposed arrangement the more sustainable option.
- In relation to industrial re-provision, the applicant advised that GLA policy required either the re-provision of existing industrial floorspace or 65% plot ratio industrial capacity, whichever was greater.
- The applicant advised that, in this case, the 65% plot ratio requirement exceeded the existing industrial floorspace and therefore formed the basis of the proposal.
- Approximately 3,020 square metres of industrial capacity would be re-provided through a combination of industrial floorspace and the dedicated industrial service yard.
- The applicant stated that this approach had been adopted on a number of other London schemes and was consistent with discussions held with the GLA.
- In response to comments regarding fenestration and design detailing, the applicant agreed to review these matters further alongside other design comments received.
- The applicant outlined a programme of community engagement undertaken throughout the pre-application process.

- Public exhibitions had been held in January 2025 and June 2025, supported by the distribution of more than 2,000 consultation leaflets to local residents and businesses.
- The applicant reported positive levels of attendance and engagement at both exhibitions.
- Feedback indicated strong interest in the retention and celebration of the Lotus heritage buildings and proposed public realm improvements.
- Whilst some concerns had been raised regarding building height, the applicant advised that residents generally recognised the wider public benefits delivered by the scheme once the proposals had been explained.
- The applicant confirmed that engagement had taken place with a number of local organisations, including representatives of the Crouch End Festival and the Campsbourne Community Collective.
- The applicant had also facilitated temporary community use of the Little Lotus building, including events relating to the history of Lotus.
- Community groups had highlighted a shortage of affordable community space within the local area.
- The applicant committed to supporting local employment opportunities during both the construction and operational phases of the development.
- Employment and training obligations would be secured through a Section 106 Agreement to maximise opportunities for local residents and businesses.
- It was noted that a date for the next Quality Review Panel (QRP) meeting had not yet been confirmed.
- The Head of Development Management confirmed back to Members a summary of the main comments they had made to ensure a clear understanding.

9. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS

John McRory introduced the report for the item, the following was noted in response to questions from the committee:

- YMCA application on Tottenham lane would come to the committee shortly as a briefing item.
- Members queried why some of the proposals had been ongoing for some time. Officers were encouraging developers to sign section 106 agreements; there is need for were a lot of negotiations, which can cause delays.
- Questions were raised regarding a preapplication proposal at Finsbury Park for a theatre and the impact on the appearance of the corner of Finsbury Park. Officers explained that there were policy constraints with this preapplication.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

10. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

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

- It was noted that there are team managers for the East and West, and that John McRory is the Major Applications Team Manager. Team managers, along with their deputies, have an overview of all decisions being made within their respective areas. Through one-to-one meetings with officers, team managers maintain awareness of how similar cases have been dealt with in comparable locations, ensuring consistency across the board. However, it was emphasised that each application is considered on its own merits.
- It was explained that some applications involving legal agreements are brought to Planning Sub Committee for decision, while others—typically smaller schemes—are determined by officers. A range of planning obligations could be secured as part of the planning process (generally via a S106 legal agreement), including the delivery of affordable housing, transport improvements, and specified levels or types of employment.
- Where applications are reported to Planning Sub Committee for decision, the heads of terms of any legal agreement are presented for Members' consideration and agreement. At that stage, the Committee resolve to grant consent. The case is then returned to officers to negotiate the finer details of the agreement. This involves ongoing discussions between officers and the applicant to finalise the terms and complete the legal agreement. It was confirmed that the agreed obligations would not change in substance, and that this stage addresses only the detailed wording and finalisation.
- It was further noted that Planning Sub Committee reports typically include a recommendation to grant consent subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement within a specified period of time. Where the agreement has not been completed by the specified date, officers have delegated authority to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the report to Planning Sub Committee

RESOLVED

To note the report.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 27th July.

CHAIR: Councillor Scott Emery

Signed by Chair

Date

