

MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 25TH OCTOBER, 2021, 7.00 - 9.30 PM

PRESENT: Councillor Sarah Williams (Chair), Councillor Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Councillor Gina Adamou, Councillor Dhiren Basu, Councillor Luke Cawley-Harrison, Councillor Emine Ibrahim, Councillor Peter Mitchell, Councillor Liz Morris, Councillor Reg Rice, Councillor Viv Ross, and Councillor Yvonne Say.

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

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

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS

There were no deputations / petitions / presentations / questions.

6. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFING: PRE/2021/0004 - HIGH ROAD WEST, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the hybrid planning application seeking outline permission for the demolition of existing buildings and for the creation of a new mixed-use development comprising residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business and service (Use Class E), leisure (Use Class E and Sui Generis) and community uses (Use Class F1/F2) together with the creation of a new public square, park and associated access, parking and public realm works with matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access within the site reserved for subsequent approval; and full planning permission for Plot A including the demolition of existing buildings and the creation of 60 residential units (Use Class C3) together with landscaping, parking and other associated works.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was clarified that the proposal would provide space for a possible bridge over the railway, as set out in the masterplan. It was also confirmed that it was intended to provide the library on the ground floor.
- It was noted that the proposals would aim to provide at least 35% affordable units by habitable room, with 500 social rent units, 406 shared ownership units, and the remaining units for market sale. The Committee understood that the current proposal was just under 35% and that, under the London Plan, the Mayor was seeking at least 50% affordable units to be delivered on publicly owned land. It was noted that the council owned the majority of the land south of White Hart Lane but that the proposals did not appear to be seeking this level of affordability. The applicant team explained that the figure of 50% related to surplus public owned land, for example where public bodies were disposing of land that was surplus to requirement. It was noted that the applicant was aiming to deliver at least 35% affordable housing across the masterplan and was achieving 40% in the south of the site; they were exploring different funding options and would provide additional affordable housing if possible.
- The Committee noted that there were multiple density figures set out in the report and enquired what the density of the proposal would be. The applicant team commented that there were different ways to calculate density, with varying levels of detail, which could produce slightly different figures. It was also noted that the density calculations which related to land area would be affected by green spaces, such as Peacock Park, which could explain some of the differences.
- The Committee welcomed the size of the social rent units, including the higher proportion of 3-bed and 4-bed units, and enquired whether additional larger units could be provided. The applicant team explained that the social rent unit proposals were bespoke to the needs of community based on the results of consultation. It was added that the initial phase of delivery would focus on rehousing the existing residents.
- In relation to car parking, it was set out in the report that, if needed, a further 7% car parking could be provided; it was enquired when this would be assessed. The applicant team stated that, following consultation, anyone in the Love Lane estate with existing parking would be given the opportunity to retain their parking but that the rest of the masterplan was more aligned with the London Plan and it would be aimed to provide blue badge parking only. It was added that, if space for car parking was not needed, the applicant would look to repurpose this space.
- The applicant team stated that there were a number of landowners in the wider area. It was explained that the regeneration element of the proposal would be delivered first and that, during this time, it would be possible to work with other landowners.
- The Committee noted that the scheme would be tenure blind but queried whether this was accurate as the council units would be delivered in a specific location, at the southern end. The applicant team confirmed that phase one of the scheme, which would be developed first in the schedule, was purely affordable housing. It was highlighted that there would be no difference in the approach to buildings for affordable and private housing, although the detailed design would be presented later on. It was added that the south of the site would incorporate a mix of different uses.

- It was commented that 35-36% of the units would be single aspect and it was asked whether this could be improved. The applicant team explained that this was being considered and that there were some areas in the masterplan with more flexibility than others.
- In relation to the design of the proposal, it was commented that there was a gradual increase in building height from the east to the west but that the view from the west, and also the south, would be quite stark. It was requested that these views were provided so that the impact on this area, including public benefit and heritage, could be fully considered. The applicant team noted that a full set of views would be provided as part of the application.
- It was suggested that it would be beneficial to manage waste on site through a combined underground system and enquired whether there would be car charging points. The applicant team noted that the proposal would have to meet the council's standards for waste and that there was an ambition to provide a communal waste solution. It was also aimed to provide electric charging points for cars.
- The Committee queried the acceptable daylight and sunlight levels which were set at 15% and asked how this compared to the average level in other projects. The applicant team noted that the proposal was situated in an urban location. It was explained that the Building Research Establishment (BRE) testing process set the levels against which the proposals would be compared and that the majority of the buildings would be required to meet these levels. It was added that the detail of these assessments would be shared in due course.
- It was noted that there would be strong cycling infrastructure as part of the scheme and that the full details would be set out in the application.
- In relation to wind levels, the applicant team stated that wind tunnel testing was considered to be the most accurate form of testing. It was explained that the scheme had undergone three rounds of testing and that each block would be fully tested to ensure that it was appropriate.
- It was explained that Lendlease's policy was to reach net zero carbon emissions by 2025 and absolute zero by 2040. It was added that they were moving all of their construction sites to be fossil fuel free by 2022 and were converting to 100% renewable electricity. It was also hoped to move a number of targets forward where possible and to use very few offsets.
- The Committee acknowledged that the proposals would have practical design that would involve low maintenance requirements but expressed some concerns that this would lead to underinvestment in the long term. The applicant team noted that the scheme would aim to provide more focused, manageable public spaces. It was explained that there would not be disparate, small, public spaces as these had historically led to maintenance issues.
- Some members of the Committee noted that a number of events took place at the nearby Tottenham Hotspur Stadium and enquired how the impact of this on the area, including the impact on the W3 bus, would be mitigated through the design of the estate. The applicant team explained that work was ongoing to alleviate issues through the masterplan, including work with residents.
- The Assistant Director of Planning, Sustainability, and Building Standards noted that the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium had its own permissions and consents and that there was a specific business and community liaison group to shape and influence some of the issues raised. It was acknowledged that the design and

layout of the current proposal should allow for crowds and other uses of the area but it was highlighted that the Committee should focus its questioning on the application in question.

- Some members of the Committee commented that there was a lot of churn in flats in the area, which could impact the local community spirit and character, and it was enquired how the applicant would mitigate any excessive purchase of units by private companies. The applicant team explained that they were committed to selling locally with a broad amenity-based offering and different types of homes and spaces. It was noted that the agreement between Lendlease and Haringey had a contractual obligation to sell locally in the first instance and that Lendlease undertook their own monitoring relating to buyers.
- The Committee commented that the design of Plot A was not architecturally interesting and it was suggested that this could be improved, possibly with some detailing or additional ideas. It was also noted that projecting balconies were not considered to work well for residents and it was queried whether the proposed heights would sit well with the neighbouring streets. The applicant team commented that these queries had lengthy responses, particularly around the incorporation of the history of the site within the design, and that further details could be shared. It was added that the proposals did include projecting balconies but that these helped with overheating and that the depth of the flats and design of the balconies meant that the units remained quite private.
- It was clarified that there would be no residential units on the ground floor by Moselle Square. It was also explained that the podium gardens would be located at first or second storey level. The provision of amenity space, including doorstep play space, would be prioritised at podium level before being provided on lower rooftops.
- It was noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had expressed some concerns about the wind levels in the proposals. The applicant team explained that the second round of testing had been shared with the QRP but that there had been a further, third round of testing and it was hoped that this would allay any concerns. The Committee noted that the application should provide assurance that the proposals would deliver comfortable spaces in relation to wind levels.
- It was enquired whether the site could be divided so that the part of the site that was council owned would be used for 100% social rent homes and the remaining part of the site would be required to provide 35% affordable homes. The Planning Officer explained that officers were not able to develop a strategy for an application in this way but would scrutinise and test proposals against policy and financial viability. Officers from Regeneration and Economic Development noted that the scheme had been developed over many years, including the procurement of a development partner and delivery in accordance with the development agreement. It was explained that the council had identified that there were requirements for external support and it was considered that this was a strong scheme that could not be delivered using an alternative method. It was added that it would not be practical to deliver elements of the scheme differently at this stage.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.

7. PLANNING SERVICES UPDATE - 2021-22 QUARTERS 1 AND 2

The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability introduced the report which provided an update on the work of the Planning Service for Quarters 1 and 2.

The Head of Development Management provided an update in relation to development management as set out in the report. It was noted that applications had increased by approximately 15% but that performance remained high, with 100% for major applications and good rates for other categories. It was highlighted that there had been roughly a 30% increase in other applications and that, although the service was under significant pressure, the average time for decisions had reduced from 87 to 81 days. It was noted that the service had introduced a fast track process for certificates of lawfulness, with decisions made within five working days, which had received positive reviews.

The Committee heard that the council had been subject to a number of overturns of refusals in relation to major applications, with a figure of 10%. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities had confirmed that the council had avoided designation this year. However, it was noted that the council had recently lost an appeal in relation to 300-306 West Green Road which was not yet included in the statistics in the report. It was noted that this could impact the next assessment and would be a risk for next year. It was added that there would be significant pressure for the service to process major applications to prevent reaching the level for designation. The Head of Development Management explained that the reason for refusal in relation to 300-306 West Green Road was the design, density, and the effect on neighbouring properties; it was added that there had been no cost implications for the council.

Attention was drawn to page 35 of the agenda pack and it was enquired why the figures relating to the total number of applications did not add up to 100%. The Head of Development Management explained that this was due to the fact that some applications were withdrawn or were not determined and not appealed.

In relation to the appeals that had been allowed, the Head of Development Management explained that there were two 'Ashley Houses' and that the appeal labelled as 'Ashley House' related to Ashley Road, Tottenham, and that this was also known as Ashley Park. It was noted that the Goods Yard application had been appealed for non-determination but it was queried whether this had been presented to the Planning Sub Committee. The Head of Development Management confirmed that the reasons for refusal in relation to the Goods Yard application had been brought to the Planning Sub Committee and had been effectively considered as a recommendation to refuse after an appeal had been submitted. It was confirmed that the decision in relation to 423-435 Lordship Lane had been made by officers under delegated powers.

The Head of Development Management explained that only one category was currently close to the threshold for designation and that there would be a right of reply if the council went over this level. It was noted that the council had strong levels of

performance and that this would make a good case; alternatively, the level could be reduced by processing additional major applications if possible.

The Interim Head of Planning Policy, Transport & Infrastructure provided an update in relation to planning policy and infrastructure. It was noted that, following the government white paper on planning reforms, there had been no further updates yet. It was commented that there had been some updates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which reflected an increased focus on design and more detail in relation to the environment and climate change. It was added that there was a new London Plan which had been published in March 2021 and now formed part of the development plan for the borough. It was also noted that there had been some significant changes in national policy relating to affordable housing in that 25% of all housing delivered through section 106 obligations were required to be first homes; these were effectively discount market sale units.

It was noted that there had been some significant changes to the planning Use Classes Order in 2020. In addition, the government had announced plans to introduce a new permitted development right to allow a change of use from any Class E (commercial, business, and service use) to Class C3 (residential use). The Interim Head of Planning Policy, Transport & Infrastructure noted that the council had confirmed an Article 4 Direction to restrict changes of use from offices to residential without full planning permission. It was explained that this applied to major town centres and designated growth areas. However, it was clarified that, due to the government introduction of the new permitted development right, the Article 4 Direction would only have effect until July 2022. It was explained that officers were exploring the possibility of confirming a new Article 4 Direction, including monitoring the actions of other boroughs and the responses they were receiving from the Secretary of State. It was noted that the NPPF requirements for Article 4 Directions had been increased but that it should be possible with a more tightly focused proposal with robust evidence.

It was highlighted that a new Local Plan was being developed and that engagement had started, in particular the Local Plan Member Working Group had been reconvened. It was explained that the Local Plan would require a strong evidence base and that this was being developed by the Planning Policy Team. It was also noted that the council had published a Housing Delivery Test Action Plan to set out how housing would be delivered in terms of additional quantity and faster timescales.

It was reported that a partial review of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule was currently in the final stage of development. It was noted that the charging schedule had been submitted about a month ago and it was expected to be examined in public in early 2022. It was highlighted that this proposed changes in the east of the borough only, with an increase in CIL charges from £15 to £50 per square metre.

It was enquired how the new ward boundaries for 2022 would impact the CIL charges. The Interim Head of Planning Policy, Transport & Infrastructure stated that ward boundaries were incidental to CIL charging to some extent but that there would be a more comprehensive review in future which could look at the consistency in relation to the new ward boundaries. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and

Sustainability added that ward boundaries were more relevant to CIL spending than charging. It was noted that communities would be consulted before new CIL spending but that, as there had been spending in March 2020, some additional time would be required to allow the CIL funds to be high enough. It was anticipated that the next round of spending would be in 2022.

In response to a query about the requirement to provide first homes, it was confirmed that first homes were classified as intermediate tenure and would, in effect, replace shared ownership. It was commented that the Greater London Authority (GLA) was not overwhelmingly supportive of first homes and it was unclear whether the industry would be supportive. It was noted that first homes would need to be considered as part of the new Local Plan, including their impact on viability, tenure mix, and the needs of the borough.

The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability provided an update in relation to building control. It was explained that the details were generally comparable to previous years and that the current market share for Building Control was 68%; this was higher than previous years and suggested that the local authority service was performing well. It was added that the service had recently appointed an apprentice and was looking to recruit a second apprentice and that this would improve the sustainability of the staffing resource.

It was commented that a Building Safety Bill had been introduced to Parliament over the summer but had not yet been confirmed. It was noted that members had received a briefing on this issue and would continue to be updated on progress and any implications.

Cllr Cawley-Harrison noted that the council had written to a number of landlords about required works and enquired whether there had been a good level of responses. It was noted that there had been a number of responses and that the Head of Building Control Services would provide a detailed response to this query.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

8. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

9. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To note the dates of future meetings:

22 February 2022

CHAIR: Councillor Sarah Williams

Signed by Chair

Date