

7:12 – 8:54

PRESENT:

Councillors: Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Cathy Brennan, Sue Jameson, Emine Ibrahim, George Dunstall and Lotte Collett

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 Emery and Cllr Bevan.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Rice stated a declaration of interest regarding item 8, he was a councillor for the ward. He would be viewing the item with an open mind.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 15th January as a correct record.

There was a petition received on Chestnuts Park application in December and the issues contained within the petition were raised by objectors at the December committee and were covered in the officer's report. There was also a separate petition on the heights of blocks at the Clarendon Development that has been considered by the Planning Service and permission had been approved in line with the Committees resolution.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2023/3058 DOWN LANE RECREATION GROUND, PARK VIEW ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON (PAGES 7 - 104)

Planning Officer Zara Zeelig introduced the report. This was planning application for Phases 2a and 3 of the Down Lane Park Improvement Programme: demolition of former Park Pavilion and Park Depot Buildings (and associated structures), and basketball court to allow for construction of a new Community Hub Building and Community Garden, new basketball

and netball courts, new children's play area, access routes, entrances and associated soft and hard landscaping.

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

- Officers sought to retain and reuse as much of the existing external railings as possible. There would be additional planting along the railings so that if necessary in the future they could potentially be removed; railings could only be removed where planting was well established and would have sufficient boundary cover.
- Regarding the removal of the Welbourne site, there was no re-provision for use. The community facility would be flexible and various uses could be accommodated.
- Harris Academy was subject to a community use plan. This plan was to provide their facilities for discounted rates for community groups. It has come to light that this hasn't come to fruition, colleagues were pursuing this and would follow up to see what had happened since.
- The scheme was reviewed twice, one of the reviews was by the Urban Design London panel which was a condition of the funding that came from GLA. One member of the Haringey QRP was included in that panel meeting. After all of the amendments requested by that panel had been implemented, it was reviewed by the QRP and in that second review, the panel supported the proposal for improvements. The project team was to be commended for the extensive design process and the amount of work completed since the Urban Design London review supported the masterplan approach.
- The current mounds are in the Southern end of the park outside of the red line boundary. This part of the park is in the Blue Line area of works being carried out through permitted development, which did not require planning permission. The intention was to broadly level that area to make it more accessible and make it more connected to the surrounding residential areas. There would be new mounds in the Northern part of the park where it's currently flattened and featureless.
- In terms of the objections, points of concern raised were the separation of the two playgrounds, additional exits and entrances, removal of the nursery, removal of the railings and the impact on women's safety. Some residents felt the boundary hedging should be in addition to the railings which should remain, concerns were also raised about how the planting would be pruned and managed and there not being adequate replacement for trees any removed. The Met Police support this proposal and felt it was an improvement in terms of safety and there had been a lot of community engagement that had gone into the design in terms of the layout and the play parks.
- 42 new trees would be provided which would provide a net gain of 39 trees.
- At the time the design was shown to the QRP, the idea was that the pergola might be extendable. Following on from this, officers agreed a slender pergola was needed. The design consisted of 3 parallel pitched roofs, the front pitched roof over the main community space would be open to the room below. The second roof and the chimneys would form part of the plan for the overall proposal. Effectively that was part of the sustainability process, the chimneys would be functioning as flues, with the air source heat pump located beside the bin store just to try to reduce noise.
- The Moselle was not part of the red line site plan.
- The proposal to include disabled parking would be an addition to the current arrangement. Cycle parking would not be segregated, this would be for all park users.
- The majority of SUDS and drainage was taking place within the two other parts of the site. There would be aspiration to push for more SUDS features within the whole

park. The current drainage arrangement was a concrete area that meant water flowed into the drains (unattenuated) and the new area which was part of this application would be permeable.

- The overall aspiration was to build up the boundaries with a denser vegetation. The initial plan would be to potentially remove the Ashley Road boundary and in front of the depot site.

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

- There would be works done to improve the lighting in the park. There had been a clear steer from the council to have an active frontage onto Park View Road from the hub. Various entrances and exits would be opened to improve accessibility. The scheme would bring forward the MUGA areas directly opposite the new community hub and new connections coming in from Ashley Road.
- The existing lighting within the park extended through the North field and along Moselle walk. Those were the only two areas in the park that had permanent lighting. There had been some temporary lighting installed between Park View Rd South and the existing former Park Pavilion building. There would be a significant uplift in the infrastructure in the park, specifically to the lighting in the North part of the park which cuts East, West and traverses the route from Park View Rd to Harris Academy. This would reflect a new pathway that would be introduced, following engagement with Harris Academy.
- 2 blue badge parking spaces were proposed as part of the scheme, the capacity for the scheme was varied dependent on the activities. There was proposed active travel as part of the scheme and there would be extra parking capacity on adjacent roads. The celebration space had a maximum capacity of 200 people, this could overspill into the garden and pergola to provide cover. Day to day usage of the building would be for yoga classes, art classes, after school clubs and resident's associations. It had the capacity for larger events which was integral to the viability of the building for the operator. Over a certain capacity would likely be subject to having an appropriate license.
- Further onsite parking would eat into the park space, there were accessible transport links available.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted following a vote with 7 for, 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 satisfactory to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended measures and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.

Conditions

1. Three years
2. Approved Plans
3. Details and Materials
4. Landscaping
5. Arboricultural Method Statement incl Tree Protection Plans
6. Lighting
7. Secure by design accreditation and certification
8. Land Contamination and Unexpected Contamination
9. Construction Logistics Plan
10. Car Parking Management Plan
11. Delivery and Servicing Plan/Waste management plan
12. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
13. Cycle parking
14. Event Management Plan
15. Noise Management Plans
16. Energy Strategy
17. Overheating
18. Sustainability and Biodiversity Measures
19. Water Butts
20. Passivhaus
21. Fire Safety Solutions
22. Surface Water Drainage Scheme
23. Detailed Management Plan

Informatives

- 1) CIL liable
- 2) Hours of construction
- 3) Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit
- 4) Asbestos

9. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The following item is a pre-application presentation to the Planning Sub-Committee and discussion of proposals.

10. PPA/2023/0093 - COLLEGE OF NORTH EAST LONDON TOTTENHAM CENTRE, HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15 4RU (PAGES 105 - 126)

Planning Officer John Kaimakamis introduced the report for the proposal seeks permission for the construction of a five-storey new building to host the Construction and Engineering Centre of the College.

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

- In the local character area of assessment, the centenary building was identified as a building of good quality. Officers would propose to use brick similar to the rest of the buildings within that area.
- Feedback from the consultation provided concerns around sustainability, noise from construction and access to the future disposal plot and site itself. The access to the site would retain the current service access. The actual pedestrian, staff and student routes would be through the current route through campus.
- There was a lot of wasted circulation space, workshops were designed and laid out in a way which lacked flexibility. The other aspect was the original building was not a

purpose-built construction centre, the site was very dense. The spaces currently were not wide enough or fit for purpose. This would be a 15-month build, the applicant was looking to appoint contractors. The aim would be to start work in the summer and then the building would be complete by December 2025.

11. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 137-142)

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.

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

12. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 143 - 158)

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period 1/01/2024 – 19/01/2024.

There were no queries on the report. The Chair noted that any queries could be directed to the Head of Development Management.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

13. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To note the date of the next meeting as 7th March.