

**PRESENT:**

**Councillors: Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, Sue Jameson, Scott Emery, Emine Ibrahim, Alexandra Worrell, George Dunstall, Lotte Collett and Sean O'Donovan**

**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 Councillor Bartlett, Councillor O'Donovan would be her substitute. This was in accordance with Committee Standing Orders 53 to 56.

**4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

**5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bevan stated he had a nonpersonal and a non-prejudicial interest in item 10 as he was a trustee of Haringey Sixth Form College and attended regular community liaison meetings with Spurs. Councillor Ibrahim stated she had a non-prejudicial interest in items 10 and 11 as she held a membership with Arsenal Football Club. She was also a member of Arsenal Independent Supporters Association. They would both be viewing the items with an open mind.

**6. MEMBERSHIP**

This item was not considered as this was discussed prior in a Special Strategic Planning Committee.

**7. MINUTES (PAGES 3 - 10)**

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 6<sup>th</sup> November as a correct record.

**8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

**9. HGY/2023/2099 CHESTNUTS PARK, ST ANNS'S ROAD N15 3AQ (PAGES 11 - 60)**

The Chair explained that she had asked officers for advice on the procedure for making a motion regarding deferral of an item. She explained that the Planning Protocol said that normally the Committee will hear representations on both / all sides before they decide to

defer for any reasons. So the normal procedure would be followed and then any decisions can be made, including on any motions.

Planning Officer Sarah Madondo introduced the report. This report was for construction of a sustainable urban drainage and associated play features and biodiversity enhancements.

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

- It was clarified that this application had 29 objections.

Amit Kamal, Chair of the Residents Garden Association attended the committee and spoke in objection to the proposal, outlining the following:

- The Friends of Chestnuts Park had diligently cared for this park on behalf of the community for the past two decades. The hard work had transformed this vital community asset in an area severely lacking in green space.
- If this was a listed park and garden characterised by its openness. Removing one third of the playing field would fundamentally change its nature and reduce both heritage and amenity value.
- Moving forward with the current proposal would contradict the principles of the Haringey deal, which promised to involve residents in key decisions and community infrastructure design.
- The Friends of the park were passionately supportive of urban drainage and that's why they were clear that this scheme should be withdrawn so that a better solution that meets the objective for park users, as well as the wider area could be found
- Over 1000 residents had signed a petition against this scheme in just three days.

Ceri Williams, local resident, attended the committee and spoke in objection to the proposal, outlining:

- That the project should not be sought for decision in its current form. It was viewed to be in the wrong location and at the wrong timing.
- This proposal would compromise the one wide space in the area.
- Chestnuts Park was too small for this scheme; no other local authority had imposed such a risky project.

Councillor Tammy Hymas attended the committee and spoke in objection to the proposal outlining:

- That the park had been a solace to people in the area because of the work done by the friends of park. It was a concern that the project could be moving forward as most of the residents did not support this, which exemplified a failure of the process. There was a strong opposition from people who had engaged in the project for a long time and had concluded that it was not right for the park. All residents wanted good flood mitigation; this had not been found. The failures of this scheme were not through a lack of engagement; the timing was wrong, and the scheme would not work in proportion. There was already huge pressure on green spaces in Haringey,
- Councillor Hymas was not sure why the scheme was proposed for approval when there were already high local concerns about the smell and the impact it would have on the usability of the park and contended that there was a need to restart the process

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

- There were various delays in starting this project due to Covid, the project team were formed late but began works quickly. There were monthly meetings with the friends of the park and this proposal was discussed, but this was not the proposal the friends of the park were expecting. They recorded their concerns in discussions. The friends of the park visited Albany Park as that was a park with the most similar project. This raised further concerns as they thought this park was in poor condition – citing a drought and diseased trees. Despite these concerns the project continued to move forward, hence the need for the friends of the park to formally oppose the project.
- Friends of the park had been involved in conversations with the Environment Agency, Thames Water, and the Council's flood officer. Chestnuts Park was not a high-risk flood area. In relation to original ideas, friends of the park looked at having swales across the north side of the park, on the margin of the park and at the edge of the park. However, there were also still hopes to raise the Stonebridge brook, which hadn't been found. There was a considerable interest in raising the original brook that ran from Crouch End to Markfield.
- Compared to flood risks in the borough, the valley of what would have been the route of the Stonebridge Brook was not one of the major flood risks.

Simon Farrow, Head of Parks and Leisure attended the committee and spoke in support of the application:

Haringey had experienced flash floods on a scale previously unheard of, particularly in the areas that surrounded Chestnut Park. As a high flood risk area, the Council Parks and Green Spaces Strategy was developed through extensive co-design and approved by the Cabinet on the 11th of July. Public consultation undertaken in the summer saw 77% of residents in support of the proposal. Through this process, varying views had been heard and it was considered that stakeholder concerns had been addressed. The initial bid submission by the stakeholders was over 5000 square metres in size across two locations within the park. This application was now under half that size, with only half being a permanent water feature and the other half usable recreational space, providing additional flood attenuation during high flood events. Officers had been unable to find the route of the Stonebridge Brook, perhaps because of its depths. As such, it was no longer a viable option. Council officers have met with other councils to share lessons learned and best practice and this was fed into the design development. The proposal would improve biodiversity of this area of the park by 38% and between 29,000 and 43,000 litres of water per day would be cleaned.

The following was noted in response to questions from the committee to the Applicant.

- In terms of Thames Water misconnections, they would have to investigate where they identified connections, then there would be a process of corresponding with the residents. If that did not work, there would be enforcement. This could take up to a year to 18 months.
- There had always been a clear understanding of what documentation and supporting reports were required to validate the planning application. One of those was the flood risk assessment, this looked at a catchment wide scenario in terms of surface water and flooding. Within that report there was clarity regarding the flood modelling that was undertaken and the identification of the properties which would benefit to the north of the park.
- Gully cleaning could help to a certain extent. In extreme weather where the water would be flowing rapidly; gullies would not work effectively.
- When officers started to look at the project and the feasibility stage design, there was an option to look at a swale running along La Rose Lane. This was in a conservation

area, due to this there would be heritage setting issues that would need to be looked at. The scheme at present had responded to a detailed arboricultural impact assessment, which sets out where developments should take place. Officers removed any excavations and the development had been moved away from the trees that had been identified as moderate value. The scheme had been informed by an ecological survey outside of the mature trees and the less intensive grass and habitat around the edge. The rest of the amenity grass was considered of poor condition ecologically as a modified grassland. Officers looked to balance and replace that within the footprint of the scheme. Through the introduction of additional hedge planting around the edge of the scheme, still mindful of intervisibility and public surveillance whilst also providing that increase in biodiversity.

- In the initial stages, there was a desire by the friends of the park to see the daylighting of the Stonebridge Brook. That is why this was further up the list than other locations might have been in the borough.
- The Flood Risk Assessment submitted as part of the planning application looked at the flood modelling identified properties around Clarence Road and to the North of the park as the likely flow path for that flood inundation. In terms of the location, the original bid had two water features, one was up in the concreted area where the old warehouses were and the other one was identified in this location.
- Officers met regularly and had workshops with the architect, thus were aware of the wider aspirations of the park. The final location, the shape, and the balance of amenity space and wetland had been influenced by the existing site conditions. Officers also considered the wider stakeholders and engagement through the planning application.
- As part of the construction work, officers would also procure the landscapers to undertake the first three years of maintenance. Going forward the maintenance plan had been shared with the friends of the park. The proposal had been designed for minimal maintenance, understanding that resources are limited in terms of the Council.
- It was explained that the scheme would provide additional attenuation and additional space features to overall improve the drainage within the residual amenity grass and the area which was again mentioned by the friends as an issue. Officers also noted they were looking at smaller scale ditches or seasonal swales to accommodate this. It was about striking a balance of trying to come up with features that were not too extensive, mindful of the environmental sensitivity and not requiring a lot of maintenance.
- In regard to the Thames Water misconnections, the intention would be for that to be picked up in condition 4 of the management and maintenance plan. Officers noted they would be happy to include that to enhancements to make it clear that the connection should not be operational until the misconnections of have been satisfactorily addressed.
- Where there were lower areas, officers would use some of the soil dug out to regrade the rest of the grassed area so that it would minimise the amounts of ponding along the rest of the grassed area.
- It was a clear principle in the work with friends that their work, in any park across the borough is additional to the core maintenance responsibilities of the Park Service.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. There had been an enhancement to condition 4 that the connection from the northern drainage shall not connect

until the misconceptions had been addressed. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted and following a chair's casting vote due to 5 in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to **GRANT planning permission** subject to the conditions and informative.

That the delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the 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.

Summary Lists of Conditions

### **Summary Conditions (a full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 1 of this report)**

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision;
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Cycle Parking;
- 4) Management and Maintenance Plan;
- 5) Construction Management Plan;
- 6) Tree Protection Plan;
- 7) Arboricultural Method Statement;
- 8) Tree Survey and
- 9) Biodiversity Management and Monitoring Plan

### **Informative**

- 1) Hours of construction
2. 2) Thames Water

## **10. HGY/2023/2137 TOTTENHAM HOTSPUR STADIUM, 748 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 0AL (PAGES 61 - 390)**

Samuel Uff, Planning Officer introduced the report for Minor Material Amendments to height, design, maximum floorspace and associated works to Plot 3 (Hotel / Residential development) of the hybrid planning permission HGY/2015/3000 (following previously approved amendments including HGY/2017/1183 to allow part residential (C3) use on Plot 3) for demolition and comprehensive redevelopment of the Northumberland Park Development Project through variation of Conditions A4 (Consented Drawings and Documents); A6 (Conformity with Environmental Statement) and Condition A7 (Maximum Quantity/Density) and D1 (Plot 3 specific drawings) under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act (EIA development).

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

- Previously in the 2016 application approval, the approved height was 100 metres. Within this application this would increase by up to 27 metres, but that was contextual. This would not be the tallest building on the wider site. The design was thought to be a significant improvement from that of the previously approved design.
- Car parking was also something that was approved previously, and that car park had already been built. There would be a parking management plan as part of that. The

difference between this development and the developments in Tottenham Hale was that when the stadium was being built, they did a lot of excavation. They went deep to build the foundations for the stadium and at the same time they future proofed this scheme by digging foundations for the hotel and the subsequent blocks, so there were likely two or three storeys deeper for car parking.

- Compared to the previous application, there had been enhancements and changes to the application conditions and design.
- In terms of the water assessment, there were two aspects of this. The water used within the hotel and the water used residentially. This would be reviewed as part of the energy and sustainability obligations. The idea would be to keep this as low as possible. There would also be SUDS as part of the wider drainage strategy. Thames Water have confirmed that this would be a sufficient capacity for the area.
- Light compensation would not be a material planning consideration, this would be a private matter. In terms of fire strategy and getting the two cores, that was one of the concerns of having the hotel and residential within the same building and having those independent cores. That was a big driver for the applicant in amending the design. The HSE considered that this would be within regulations and an improvement in what was previously submitted. In terms of section 106 contributions for Bruce Castle, there is a play space contribution. This had not been designated to a specific park in the locality yet. There would be a discussion internally as where best to have this. There were additional built-in elements of various amenities for residents.
- The carbon offset calculation was based on the GLA guidance of offsetting any carbon reductions that haven't been met on site by 30 years.
- Cycle parking would be in line with the London Cycle design standard. This document recommends two tier cycle parking.
- In relation to Worcester Avenue, there were no plans to change the existing operation. Currently, there were bollards which are supported by the traffic management order.

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

- In terms of Air BnB risk, the principle of the conversion of the service departments from C1 hotel use to C3 residential use had already gone through, it was not part of this application to convert them from hotel service departments. Residential is subject to the existing regulatory restrictions across London on short term lets.
- It was noted that Haringey Sixth Form College would be keen to be involved in the training aspect provided.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. Subject to section 106 and as set out in the papers and the addendum and with the addition of specific mention of the Haringey Sixth Form College in the obligation for the training hotel. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted following a vote with 11 in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability 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 or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability securing the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below following referral to the Mayor of London.

2. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 11/02/2024 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow.
3. 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 is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
4. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions (planning permission) 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.

**Conditions Summary for the entire masterplan site –** (Full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 01 of this report. Conditions 1-16 are replicated and amended where necessary from the extant permission HGY/2015/3000).

- 1) Implementation Timescales – Full
- 2) Reserved Matters
- 3) Phasing Plan
- 4) Consented drawings and documents
- 5) Business and Community Liaison construction Group
- 6) Conformity with Environmental Statement
- 7) Maximum quantum / density
- 8) Materials
- 9) Materials boards
- 10) Flood Risk Management
- 11) Drainage (amended +40% climate change)
- 12) Interim landscape plan and meanwhile uses
- 13) Plant and machinery
- 14) Demolition of locally listed buildings (condition discharged)
- 15) Elements of the Edmonton Dispensary and Red House Coffee Palace Facade and Interiors Retention (condition discharged)
- 16) Carbon savings

**Conditions Summary for the Plot 3:**

- 1) Consented drawings
- 2) Construction Environmental Management Plan
- 3) Air Quality and Dust Management Plan
- 4) Construction Waste Management Plan
- 5) Construction hours
- 6) Piling method statement
- 7) Temporary site hoarding
- 8) CCTV
- 9) Lighting
- 10) Waste and refuse
- 11) Energy Centre flues
- 12) Landscape management
- 13) Hours of operation of rooftop terraces
- 14) Contamination

- 15) Contamination remediation
- 16) Telecommunications
- 17) Cooling demand
- 18) Parking management plan
- 19) Cycle storage
- 20) Hard and soft landscaping
- 21) Wind mitigation
- 22) Fire statement
- 23) Accessible housing
- 24) Secured by Design
- 25) Noise attenuation
- 26) Non-Road Mobile Machinery 1
- 27) Non-Road Mobile Machinery 2
- 28) Energy Strategy
- 29) PV arrays
- 30) BREEAM outcome
- 31) Telecommunications Equipment

**Informatives Summary** – (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 01 to this report).

- 1) Conditions discharged previously
- 2) Working with the applicant
- 3) Community Infrastructure Levy
- 4) Numbering New Development
- 5) Dust
- 6) Disposal of Commercial Waste
- 7) Environment Agency permits
- 8) Metropolitan Police
- 9) Piling method
- 10) Minimum Water Pressure
- 11) Paid Garden Waste Collection Service
- 12) Sprinkler Installation
- 13) Land Ownership
- 14) Site preparation works
- 15) Site Preparation Works

**Section 106 Heads of Terms (\* indicates existing obligations) :**

**1) Podium and Public Access\***

- a) Year round public access to podium and other publicly accessible areas (apart from one day a year) from completion of development Phase 3.
- b) Maintenance of Podium and public realm.
- c) Cultural / Community Events (12 per year for 6 years) from date of this decision notice.

**2) Playspace Contribution**

- a) Off-site provision for £17,670.

**3) Art management Strategy** – prioritising use of local artists and cultural significance.

**4) Car Capping** – No future occupiers will be entitled to apply for a residents or business parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development.

**5) Car Club Contributions** - Two years' free membership for all residents and £50.00 per year credit for the first 2 years; and an enhanced car club membership for the residents of the family-sized units (3+ bedrooms) including 3 years' free membership and £100 (one hundred pounds in credit) per year for the first 3 years.



**6) Residential & Hotel\* Travel Plans** comprising:

- a) Appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator (to also be responsible for monitoring Delivery Servicing Plan)
- b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information, map and timetables, to every new household.
- c) £3,000 for monitoring of the travel plan initiatives.

**7) Highways Agreement**

- a) Include Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment and Highway Safety Audit
- b) See Section 278 Agreement Heads of Terms.

**8) Servicing and Delivery Plan\*:**

- a) outline how all servicing for the wider site will be operated and clarify use of any on-street loading bays.
- b) step by step details of access to and from the Highway,
- c) the oversight of vehicles as they move across the Podium (details of marshalling arrangements and numbers of marshals),
- d) swept paths to show progress between landscaping and any other features,
- e) management arrangements to ensure visiting service vehicles adhere to their booked slots and dwell durations to ensure as smooth working as possible to accommodate movements in this area without compromising the pedestrian environment and movements.
- f) A ban on vehicular movement on the podium with the exception of emergency vehicles during the critical pedestrian times.

**9) Cycle Strategy\***

**10) Employment & Skills Plan\*** - Including Construction apprenticeships Support Contribution and Skills Contribution (to be calculated in accordance with Planning Obligations SPD) prioritised for Haringey residents.

**11) Business Opportunities\***

**12) Commitment to being part of the borough's Construction Partnership\*.**

**13) Future connection to District Energy Network (DEN)\***

- a) Submission of Energy Plan for approval by LPA
- b) Ensure the scheme is designed to take heat supply from the proposed DEN (including submission of DEN Feasibility Study)
- c) Design of secondary and (on-site) primary District Heat Network (DHN) in accordance with LBH Generic Specification and approval of details at design, construction, and commissioning stages.
- d) Use all reasonable endeavours to negotiate a supply and connection agreement with the DHN within a 10-year window from the date of a planning permission.

**14) Provision of EV car parking Spaces\***

**15) Carbon offsetting\***

- Payment of an agreed carbon offset amount (residential & non-residential) plus 10% management fee on commencement.

**16) Ultrafast broadband infrastructure** and connections to be provided.

**17) Commitment to Considerate Contractors Scheme\***

**18) Monitoring\***

- Based on 5% of the financial contribution total and £500 per non-financial contribution.

**Section 278 Highways Legal Agreement Heads of Terms**

**19) Planned and funded public highway improvements to Park Lane**

2.5 In the event that members choose to make a resolution contrary to officers' recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

2.6 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning application be refused for the following reasons:

i. In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable housing and 2) viability review mechanisms the proposals would fail to foster a mixed and balanced neighbourhood where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies GG1, H4, H5 and H6, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM11 and DM13, and Policy TH12.

ii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing financial contributions towards open space, the scheme would fail to provide sufficient amenities for future residents contrary to London Plan Policy S1, Strategic Policies SP16 and SP17, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policies AAP1, AAP11 and NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM48.

iii. In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) a residential Travel Plan and financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, 2) Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments to change car parking control measures, 3) car club contributions and 4) podium access the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel and fail to mitigate the impacts of the development and provide the benefits envisaged for the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T5, T1, T2, T3, T4 and T6. Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.

iv. In the absence of an Employment and Skills Plan and Ultrafast broadband infrastructure the proposals would fail to ensure that Haringey residents benefit from growth and regeneration. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy E11 and DM DPD Policy DM40.

v. In the absence of a legal agreement securing an art strategy the proposal would fail to achieve a high quality design contrary to Local Plan Policy SP11 and Policy DM1 of the DM DPD.

vi. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of an energy strategy, including connection to a DEN, and carbon offset payments the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy SI 2 and Strategic Policy SP4, and DM DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.

vii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme and the borough's Construction Partnership, the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D14, Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission provided that:

- i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
- ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and

iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

2.8 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:

- i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
- ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal.

#### **11. HGY/2023/2306 & 2307 PRINTWORKS 819-829 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 8ER (PAGES 391 - 616)**

Phillip Elliot, Planning Officer introduced the report for Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures to the rear of 819-829 High Road; the demolition of 829 High Road; and redevelopment for purpose-built student accommodation (Sui Generis) and supporting flexible commercial, business and service uses (Class E), hard and soft landscaping, parking, and associated works. To include the change of use of 819-827 High Road to student accommodation (Sui Generis) and commercial, business and service (Class E) uses. (HGY/2023/2306) Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to 819/821 High Road (Grade II), including reinstatement of hipped roof, demolition works to the rear, façade and related external works, internal alterations, and associated works. (HGY/2023/2307)

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

- Permission was granted a year ago to build apartments alongside a cinema. The operator that the applicant had on board for the cinema use had dropped out of the scheme. Therefore, that scheme could not be delivered, and it was no longer viable.
- In the London Plan it explained that these buildings and smaller self-contained single person units had potential to free up space. There would be a significant portion of the student accommodation which would be affordable as well.
- There was an evidence-based document called the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This had been produced for the emerging new local plan and for the new housing strategy. That evidence-based document talked about student housing, student numbers were rising and it acknowledged that student bed spaces can be counted towards housing supply in terms of meeting Haringey's housing target.
- There would be 250 long stay cycle parking spaces and 9 short stay cycle parking spaces.
- Single aspect units tended to be found in student accommodation due to the sizes of the rooms, the amenity spaces would be dual aspect.
- Student accommodation had different parking provisions to residential accommodation, which was 10% and therefore meant 1 disabled parking space would be available.
- This would be a project with sprinklers.
- The difficulty in providing other housing alongside student accommodation was due to the plan layout and the nature of having the High Road buildings and courtyards

behind. Additionally, the operator focused on student accommodation. To have that mixed management in the scheme would prove difficult to have a PBSA operator.

- There would be 287 bed spaces, this would translate to 114 units towards Haringey housing targets. Housing need in the planning system is crystallized and defined by the Haringey housing target of 1592 homes per year. This proposal, in accordance with the London Plan policy, would contribute towards that figure.
- Over the summer when students wouldn't be at the accommodation, there would be an opportunity for other people to come and use the space. Any temporary use should not disrupt the accommodation of the resident students during their academic year.
- The London Strategic Housing Market Assessment was the evidence base that sits behind the London plan. Student need was including students whose parents did not own a home and who could not therefore act as rental guarantors for their children. This need also included students who may, due to a disability or impairment, struggle to find accessible private rented sector accommodation that would meet their needs. There was a need for 88,500 purpose-built student accommodation bed spaces.

During this item, at 10pm The Chair stated for the record in accordance with Committee Standing Order 18, to note that no meeting should continue after 10pm except that of discussion of the specific item or case in at hand at 10pm may continue thereafter at the discretion of the Chair of the meeting. Consideration of any business remaining shall be deferred to the next ordinary meeting, expect where the matter(s) falls to be dealt with under the urgency provisions.

Cllr Bevan put forward a motion to increase the number of disabled parking bays to 3. This was seconded by Cllr Rice and followed a vote of 4 for and 7 against. The motion was not carried.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, 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 granted and following a vote with 10 in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions.

## **RESOLVED**

1. That the Committee authorise the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to GRANT planning permission and listed building consent subject to the conditions and informatives set out below and the completion of an agreement satisfactory to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability securing the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 29/03/2024 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in their sole discretion allow.
3. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
4. That the Committee resolve to GRANT Listed Building Consent and that the

Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the Listed Building Consent and impose conditions and informatives.

5. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions (planning permission and/or Listed Building Consent) 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.

Conditions Summary – Planning Application HGY/2023/2306 (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 01 of this report).

- 1) 5-year time limit
- 2) Approved Plans & Documents
- 3) Contract - No demolition of No. 829 High Road until contract let to build the Printworks Block.
- 4) Photographic survey
- 5) Accessible Student Accommodation
- 6) Commercial Units - Ventilation/Extraction
- 7) Commercial Units - Café/restaurant Opening Hours
- 8) BREEAM Certificate
- 9) Commercial Units – Noise Attenuation
- 10) Noise Attenuation – Student Accommodation
- 11) Detailed Fire Statement
- 12) Landscape Details
- 13) Trees & Planting – 5-year Replacement
- 14) Biodiversity
- 15) External Materials and Details – Printworks Buildings
- 16) External Materials and Details – Nos. 823-827 High Road
- 17) No new Plumbing on outside of Nos. 823-827 High Road
- 18) No new Grilles on outside of Nos. 823-827 High Road
- 19) Living roofs
- 20) Ground Floor Western Boundary Details
- 21) Energy Strategy
- 22) Overheating (Student Accommodation)
- 23) Overheating (Non-Resi)
- 24) Building User Guide
- 25) Metering Strategy
- 26) Den Connection
- 27) PV Arrays
- 28) Urban Greening Factor
- 29) Secured by Design
- 30) Stage I Written Scheme of Investigation of Archaeology (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 31) Stage II Written Scheme of Investigation of Archaeology
- 32) Foundation Design – Archaeology (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 33) Written scheme of historic building investigation (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 34) Land Contamination
- 35) Unexpected Contamination
- 36) Combined Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit – Brunswick Square (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 37) Car Parking Design & Management Plan
- 38) Cycle Parking Details
- 39) Delivery and Servicing Plan
- 40) Student Waste Management Plan

- 41) Detailed Construction Logistics Plan (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 42) Public Highway Condition (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 43) Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 44) Management and Control of Dust (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 45) Non-Road Mobile Machinery 1 (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 46) Non-Road Mobile Machinery 2 (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 47) Impact Piling Method Statement (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 48) Business and Community Liaison Construction Group (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 49) Telecommunications
- 50) Evidence of operational public hydrants/suitable alternatives
- 51) Clean water capacity to serve the development (Thames Water)
- 52) Water Efficiency Condition

Informatives Summary – Planning Application HGY/2023/2306 (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 01 to this report).

- 1) Working with the applicant
- 2) Community Infrastructure Levy
- 3) Hours of Construction Work
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Numbering New Development
- 6) Asbestos Survey prior to demolition
- 7) Dust
- 8) Written Scheme of Investigation – Suitably Qualified Person
- 9) Deemed Discharge Precluded
- 10) Composition of Written Scheme of Investigation
- 11) Disposal of Commercial Waste
- 12) Piling Method Statement Contact Details
- 13) Minimum Water Pressure
- 14) Paid Garden Waste Collection Service
- 15) Sprinkler Installation
- 16) Designing out Crime Officer Services
- 17) Land Ownership
- 18) Site Preparation Works
- 19) Listed building consent
- 20) S106 agreement and s278 agreement

Conditions Summary – Listed Building Consent Application HGY/2023/2307 (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 02 of this report).

- 1) 5-year time limit.
- 2) Development to be in accordance with approved plans and documents.
- 3) Contract to complete works to be in place prior to demolition.
- 4) Matching materials
- 5) Hidden historic features
- 6) Redundant plumbing, mechanical & electrical services
- 7) Making good redundant plumbing, mechanical & electrical services
- 8) Approval of details, including method statements (various)
- 9) Masonry cleaning
- 10) No new plumbing
- 11) No new grilles

Informatives Summary – Listed Building Consent HGY/2023/2307 (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 02 to this report).

- 1) Working with the applicant
- 2) External materials to be approved pursuant to Planning Permission (HGY/2023/2306)

## Section 106 Heads of Terms:

### Affordable Housing

1) Affordable Student Accommodation – Affordable Student Accommodation Scheme to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of development:

- a. Minimum of 35% of the proposed accommodation shall be affordable student bedspaces (101 student bedspaces)
- b. Affordable student accommodation residents to have access to the same communal amenity as the market accommodation.
- c. The rent charged must include all services and utilities which are offered as part of the package for an equivalent non-affordable room in the development. There should be no additional charges specific to the affordable accommodation.

### 2) Affordability

a. Affordable student accommodation shall meet the following affordability criteria:

The definition of affordable student accommodation is a Purposebuilt student accommodation (PBSA) bedroom that is provided at a rental cost for the academic year equal to or below 55 per cent of the maximum income that a new full-time student studying in London and living away from home could receive from the Government's maintenance loan for living costs for that academic year.

The actual amount the Mayor defines as affordable student accommodation for the coming academic year is published in the Mayor's Annual Monitoring Report.

Should the Government make significant changes to the operation of the maintenance loan for living costs as the main source of income available from the Government for higher education students, the Mayor will review the definition of affordable student accommodation and may provide updated guidance.

- b. the affordable student accommodation bedrooms shall be allocated by the higher education provider(s) that operates the accommodation, or has the nomination right to it, to students it considers most in need of the accommodation.
- c. The rent charged must include all services and utilities which are offered as part of the package for an equivalent non-affordable room in the development. There should be no additional charges specific to the affordable accommodation.
- d. The initial annual rental cost for the element of affordable accommodation should not exceed the level set out in the Mayor's Annual Monitoring Report for the relevant year. For following years, the rental cost for this accommodation shall be linked to changes in a nationally recognised index of inflation.
- e. A review period shall be set to allow for recalibrating the affordable student accommodation to the level stated as affordable in the Mayor's Annual Monitoring Report.

### 3) Viability Review Mechanism

- a. Early-Stage Review if not implemented within 2 years.
- b. Break review – review if construction is suspended for 2 years or more.

4) Student use only in term time - Accommodation secured for the use of students only during the academic year.

- Outside of the academic year the building shall only provide accommodation for conference delegates, visitors, interns on university placements, and students on short-term education courses or any similar use at any institution approved in advance in writing by the local planning authority, acting reasonably. The temporary use shall not

disrupt the accommodation of the resident students during their academic year. Any ancillary use described above shall only be for a temporary period each year and shall not result in a material change of use of the building.

5) Nomination Agreement - The majority of the bedrooms in the development including all of the affordable student accommodation bedrooms shall be secured through a nomination agreement for occupation by students of one or more higher education provider.

#### Transportation

6) Future Connectivity & Access Plan – setting out how the development shall be constructed to allow for potential future pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access across the development to and from adjacent land (Peacock Industrial Estate).

7) Percival Court resurfacing - Works to resurface Percival Court within the application site and for the length of the application site up to the High Road.

8) Car Capping – No future occupiers will be entitled to apply for a residents or business parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development. The applicant must contribute a sum of £4000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order for this purpose.

9) Car Club Contributions - Two years' free membership for all residents and £50.00 credit.

10) Student & Commercial Travel Plans comprising:

a) Appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator (to also be responsible for monitoring Delivery Servicing Plan) to monitor the travel plan initiatives annually for a minimum period of 5 years.

b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information, map and timetables, along with a £200 voucher for active travel related equipment purchases for every new student.

c) Each travel plan requires the payment of £2,000 (two thousand pounds) per year, per travel plan for monitoring of the travel plans for a period of 5 years.

11) Highways Agreement – See Section 278 Agreement Heads of Terms.

#### Employment and Training

12) Employment & Skills Plan - Including Construction apprenticeships Support Contribution and Skills Contribution (to be calculated in accordance with Planning Obligations SPD).

13) Commitment to being part of the borough's Construction Partnership. Carbon Management and Sustainability

14) Energy & Potential future connection to District Energy Network

a) Submission of Energy Plan for approval by LPA

b) Ensure the scheme is designed to take heat supply from the proposed DEN where viable (including submission of DEN Feasibility Study)

c) Design of secondary and (on-site) primary District Heat Network (DHN) in accordance with LBH Generic Specification and approval of details at design, construction, and commissioning stages.

d) Use all reasonable endeavours to negotiate a supply and connection agreement with the DHN within a 10-year window from the date of a planning permission.

e) Sustainability review

f) Heating strategy fall-back option if not connecting to the DEN

h) Deferred carbon off-set contribution

i) To install solar PV in the roof area reserved for the low-carbon heating



solution if connecting to the DEN

15) Carbon offsetting

Payment of an agreed carbon offset amount (residential & non-residential) plus 10% management fee on commencement.

Telecommunications

16) Ultrafast broadband infrastructure and connections to be provided.

Construction

17) Commitment to Considerate Contractors Scheme.

Monitoring

18) Based on 5% of the financial contribution total and £500 per non-financial contribution.

Section 278 Highways Legal Agreement Heads of Terms

19) Works to widen Brunswick Square public highway

20) Works to link in with High Road public highway

21) Works to resurface Brunswick Square for the length of the application site up to the High Road

Section 38 of the Highways Act

22) The adoption of a widened Brunswick Square including the new loading bay would require a section 38 agreement.

2.6 In the event that members choose to make a resolution contrary to officers' recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

2.7 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning application and Listed Building Consent applications be refused for the following reasons:

Planning Application

i. In the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) the provision of on-site affordable student accommodation 2) A nomination agreement and 3) viability review mechanisms the proposals would fail to meet the student accommodation and affordability aspirations for London. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies GG1, H4, H5 and H15, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM13, DM15 and Policy NT5.

ii. In the absence of legal agreement securing 1) a Student Travel Plan and financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring, 2) Traffic Management Order (TMO) amendments to change car parking control measures, 3) and car club contributions the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T5, T1, T2, T3, T4 and T6. Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.

iii. In the absence of an Employment and Skills Plan the proposals would fail to ensure that Haringey residents benefit from growth and regeneration. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy E11 and DM DPD Policy DM40.

iv. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of an energy strategy, including connection to a DEN, and carbon offset payments the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan Policy SI 2 and Strategic Policy SP4, and DM DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.

v. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the developer's participation in the Considerate Constructor Scheme and the borough's Construction Partnership, the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of demolition

and construction and impinge the amenity of adjoining occupiers. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D14, Policy SP11 and Policy DM1.

#### Listed Building Consent

i. In the absence of a planning permission for the proposed change of use of the ground floor and conversion of the upper floors to housing, the proposed removal of historic fabric and internal and external alterations would be unnecessary and unacceptable. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan Policies HC1, Strategic Policy SP12 and DM DPD Policy DM9.

### **12. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 617 - 632)**

To advise of major proposals in the pipeline including those awaiting the issue of the decision notice following a committee resolution and subsequent signature of the section 106 agreement; applications submitted and awaiting determination; and proposals being discussed at the pre-application stage.

This item was not discussed due to Committee Procedure rule 18 of no meeting continuing past 10pm.

### **13. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 633 - 660)**

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period 23/10/2023 – 24/11/2023.

This item was not discussed due to Committee Procedure rule 18 of no meeting continuing past 10pm.

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

### **15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To note the date of the next meeting as 15th January.

The meeting ended at 10.15pm