

# **MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY, 10TH FEBRUARY, 2020, 19:00 – 21:15**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Vincent Carroll (Chair), Gina Adamou (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Peter Mitchell, Viv Ross, Yvonne Say and Sarah Williams

## **384. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

Noted.

## **385. PLANNING PROTOCOL**

Noted.

## **386. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tabois, Councillor Basu and Councillor Hinchcliffe.

## **387. URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

## **388. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ross declared he was a member of the Canal and River Trust.

Councillor Bevan declared he attended a monthly meeting with Tottenham Hotspur which discussed any issues that arose from the operations of the stadium.

## **389. MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11<sup>th</sup> November 2019 be approved.

## **390. PRE/2019/0212 - (A) NORTHUMBERLAND TERRACE (NOS. 790 TO 794 AND NOS. 798 TO 808 HIGH ROAD, N17) AND LAND TO THE REAR AND (B) NO. 807 HIGH ROAD N17**

*Clerk's note - Prior to considering the application, the Chair granted a Member request to allow the Committee 10 minutes to read and consider Appendix 2(b) which was circulated to Members in a supplementary pack on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2020.*

The Committee considered a pre-application proposal regarding (a) Northumberland Terrace (Nos. 790 to 794 and Nos. 798 to 808 High Road, N17) and land to the rear

and (b) No. 807 High Road, N17. The majority of the proposed development would be on the east side of the High Road. However, the redevelopment of No. 807 on the west side of the road would facilitate the relocation of the Co-operative Funeral Care business and potentially the existing dentist surgery, which are currently at No. 806 and 802 High Road respectively.

East side of the High Road (Northern Terrace and land to rear)

- (a) Erection of a new four storey building to the west of Lilywhite House for flexible A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2 use, including the demolition of the locally listed rear extension to No. 814 High Road, and new hard/soft landscaping works; (b) Internal and external repairs, enhancements and minor alterations to the statutory and locally listed buildings along the High Road to facilitate their meaningful future reuse for a flexible range of uses within the A1/A2/A3/B1/D1/D2 use classes; and (c) the demolition of rear extensions to Nos. 798, 800/802, 804/806 and 808 High Road and the erection of new rear extensions to Nos. 800/802 and 804/806 and 808 High Road.

West side of the High Road (No. 807)

- (b) Redevelopment of No. 807 High Road to provide a four-storey building comprising retail (A1) on the ground floor, a business/dentist surgery on the first floor (B1/D1) and two dwellings (C3) on the upper floors. There would be a second four-storey building at the rear, joined by a covered parking area with a landscaped courtyard on top, to provide seven dwellings (C3). There would be nine dwellings in total.

The Planning Officer and representatives for the applicant delivered a presentation on plans for the scheme. The representatives provided the Committee with a detailed handout on the proposals.

The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentation and invited Committee Members to raise any comments or questions. The following was discussed:

- The representatives noted the linear building was there to mediate the scale of Lilywhite House.
- Regarding access, the intent was to create much cleaner access, with a one direction through-route at the side of the site.
- The developers wanted to create a vibrant space that people wanted to visit.
- The cycle parking was to be completely replaced with a new and secure gated facility. Access was to be provided to those residents who owned cycle parking but there would also be cycle parking available to the public.
- It was suggested the proposals for 807 could be bolder.
- The proposed buildings would be a mixture of brick and steel structure, with the steel structure not being visible. The linear building would be a steel structure but the extensions to the existing building would be load bearing masonry.
- Quality materials would be used which were appropriate for the environment.
- The Northumberland Terrace proposals were criticised for being plain and the wrong side of traditional and modern. The gating on the east was called oppressive and at stark contrast with the surrounding buildings.
- It was suggested where brick lintels were used, these should be detailed and in line with surrounding properties.

- The proposals were still a work in progress and work on the boundary treatment was ongoing.
- With regard to 807, the representatives noted they were trying to strike a balance between a modern building with details from the existing building being maintained.
- Regarding the vision for the space, the applicants were trying to create an ecosystem with the public able to have access to the buildings. Access to the public would be restricted on match days, however, emergency services would have access at all times.
- Concern was raised over the potential for traffic issues as a result of the scheme. In response, the representatives noted that there were no traffic implications as a result of any work to 807.
- It was not possible to attain the adjoining properties to 807 as they were not within Tottenham Hotspurs ownership.
- Concern was raised over the absence of affordable workspace. In response, it was noted that whilst there was none proposed in the scheme, the Club had been exploring what the Council's policy was on the matter. If it was requested that a mixture of workspace was necessary in order for the scheme to be policy compliant, that would be addressed.
- It was requested that the applicant's response to each of the recommendations by the QRP be set out clearly so that the Committee could see what action had been taken to date.
- The Committee praised the detailed tabled papers provided by the representatives.

### **391. PPA/2019/0012 - LOCK KEEPERS COTTAGES, FERRY LANE**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of the existing houses and erection of a 3-6 storey mixed-use development including a café at ground floor, approximately 690 sq.m. of office space on the ground to first floors and 13 flats on the floors above. The scheme would be a 'car free' development with 1 accessible parking space provided approximately 100 metres from the main residential entrance on Hale Village. The proposal would provide an Estate Management Office for Hale Village to replace the existing temporary office on Millmead Road.

The Planning Officer and representatives for the applicant gave a presentation on plans for the scheme.

The Chair thanked the representatives for their presentation and requested more detailed and tailored visuals for the scheme be made available before any future applications. The Chair then invited Committee Members to raise any comments or questions. The following was discussed:

- The Committee had serious concerns over the wheelchair accessible car parking space for the site. The Committee was not convinced by the proposal for the single car parking space that was required for the wheelchair accessible unit being provided off-site within the existing Hale village development. This was considered too unreasonable and too far from the development. It was noted that it was a policy requirement for a development of this size to provide a wheelchair accessible unit.

- There was concern the area was already over developed.
- The representatives noted that the primary purpose of the scheme was to provide Lee Valley Estates with a head office so that they could continue employing people in the area. The secondary purpose was to provide estate management. However, the scheme was only viable with the residential element.
- There was concern surrounding entrances to the towpath and also the balconies over the towpath. The representatives noted there was some overlap onto the towpath on the eastern elevation, but this would only be by around 800millimetres, with none of the balconies hanging over the canal.
- The representatives noted they had worked closely with the Canal and River Trust over this development, who they claimed were supportive of the scheme. It was suggested that the developers contribute to the refurbishment of the lock. The representatives responded that they had held discussions with the Canal and River Trust and would provide written confirmation of any agreements made between the two before any future application. They claimed there had been an assurance from the Trust that, were the development to go ahead, then the locks would become a priority to be fixed.
- The representatives accepted the plans were close to the set boundaries, but this was done to utilise all the available space.
- There was concern over the usage of green walls in the scheme.
- The Committee sought to see the Applicant's individual responses provided to each recommendation raised by the QRP. The representatives agreed and informed they had already adopted some of the proposed changes by the QPR, such as moving access from the tow path to Ferry Lane for the residential properties.
- The representatives advised that the scheme was not able to support affordable housing as it was not viable.
- Regarding the shared lift for the café and residential properties, the representatives informed this would be fob operated and only residents with a fob could access the properties.
- There was concern over the design and how the development fitted into the surrounding area, with the absence of any rationale for the colour scheme criticised. The representatives claimed the development had been designed with the surrounding area considered.
- The yellow window frames would be aluminium, with the yellow cladding also likely to be aluminium.
- The absence of any parking close to the development was criticised as not being practical.

### **392. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS**

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

### **393. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS**

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted.

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

N/A.

**395. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

9<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

CHAIR: Councillor Vincent Carroll

Signed by Chair .....

Date .....

This page is intentionally left blank