

Planning Sub Committee, 3rd June 7:05 – 8:38pm

Present: Lester Buxton, Sean O'Donovan, Emine Ibrahim, Alexandra Worrell, Lotte Collet, Cathy Brennan, Barbara Blake, Reg Rice, Scott Emery, John Bevan

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.

3. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 7th March as a correct record.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

7. HGY/2023/3250 ST ANNS GENERAL HOSPITAL, ST ANNS ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N15 3TH (PAGES 13 - 82)

John McRory introduced the report. This was application for reserved matters seeking approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale in respect of Phases 1b and 2 of the site pursuant to Condition 61 of Planning Permission Reference HGY/2022/1833 dated 10 July 2023 for "outline planning permission (with all matters reserved except for access) for Phases 1B, 2 and 3, for: (a) the erection of new buildings for residential development (Use Class C3) and a flexible range of non-residential uses within Use Class E, F1/F2; (b) provision of associated pedestrian and cycle accesses; (c) landscaping including enhancements to the St Ann's Hospital Wood and Tottenham Railsides Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); and, (d) car and cycle parking spaces and servicing spaces". Details are provided to partially satisfy Conditions 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73 for

Phases 1b and 2 of the site of Outline Planning Permission Reference HGY/2022/1833.

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

- In the original hybrid approval, a large number of existing hospital buildings had been retained. These buildings would be restored and converted into various non-residential community and commercial uses. A fair amount of landscaping was also being retained and enhanced, this included the large central garden, which was being substantially increased in size. There would be a boundary between the retained hospital and residential area.
- Overheating strategies needed to follow the cooling hierarchy. This would mean that passive measures would be introduced before any mechanical ventilation or active measures. It was imperative that the risk of overheating was reduced as much as possible before introducing the cooling. In this instance, some of the units were constrained by noise along the railway line and that was the reason why the overheating strategy varied across the building blocks.
- There had been changes to increase the number of corridors which would provide daylight, but this was approved in outline with the detailed and restrictive parameter plans. There was not a lot of flexibility regarding the master plan. The vast majority of the single aspect flats were one bedroom; There was a good standard of flat design and a good proportion of single/dual aspect flats.
- A broad arrangement for waste collection had been agreed in the parameter plans. A further condition will be added for further details on this to be submitted.
- In terms of the use of open spaces, this would be dealt with through the outline of consent and management plan. Buildings would be restored early on which would be a placemaking opportunity in establishing activity and commercial spaces.
- There would be a proportion of parking on site to deal with disabled car parking and for the larger family size units.
- A specialist sub-contractor would be managing the space, they would also look after the trees on site. Everything across the estate would be managed by the this sub-contractor.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. It was noted that there would be an additional waste storage condition. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted following a vote with 10 for, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT CONSENT for the reserved matters

application and approval of details in relation to Conditions 63 (Reserved Matters Compliance Statement), 65 (Drawing References), 66 (Cycle Provision), 67 (Accessible Housing), 68 (Fire Statement), 69 (Ecological Impact Assessment), 70 (Circular Economy Statement), 71 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme), 72 (Boundary Walls) and Condition 73 (Climate Change Adaptation) is determined under delegation powers once the outstanding issues are resolved.

2. That the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability or the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the reserved matters consent and impose conditions [and informatives] to secure the following matters:

Conditions

Approval of Materials (Samples) and details of waste storage

8. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

9. PPA/2021/0030 SIR FREDERICK MESSER ESTATE (PAGES 83 - 104)

Gareth Prosser introduced the report for erection of 66 new homes within two, six storey blocks providing 100% social rent homes, 10% wheelchair accessible homes, cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, and all other associated works.

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

- A letter would be delivered to all residents on the estate in regard to the consultation on this proposal. An earlier consultation which had a larger footprint garnered positive engagement.
- There would be no single aspect units in this development. All 3 bedrooms flats would have separate kitchens and living rooms.
- There were ongoing discussions regarding parking in this development, it was a very live issue to ensure that there would not be a further impact on parking. Officers were trying to rationalise the existing arrangement; this would be picked up further with the transport team.
- There were no category A trees are being lost, the majority of mature trees were category B.
- Officers could not build higher than six storeys, this set a benchmark and was the reason for concentrating a tall building in one location.
- There would be an L shaped kitchen/diner area.
- There were concerns around the size of the lifts in the development, these would be taken back to the applicant.
- The Triangle centre was close to Frederick Messer estate. This was a well-used children's and community centre.
- At the moment, the focus was on the landscape aspect of the development. However, introduction of a substantial non-residential element would exponentially change the infrastructure costs in terms of fire safety. It was

important to try and find the balance in viability in terms of how much extra could be given to the estate. There would be a red line boundary around this site and that would be the key focus for the plan. However, officers were looking at a much wider estate strategy to try and tie in the different areas mentioned.

- The QRP approved the principles in the way that the deck access had been laid out, they would welcome further design development to see how officers could look at the detail of it.
- Currently the aim would be for this development to have social rent.
- Officers had taken comments from QRP in regard to parking on board, officers had been asked to maximise the amount of wheelchair spaces; this would put pressure in this area. There was work in the pipeline to bring all enforcement to the parking service.

10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 105 - 120)

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.

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

- Regarding Partridge Way, officers generally did not include the amendment applications in this list. The expectation would be that this would be a delegated decision.
- The listing of Frederick Messer was a previous proposal, this would be updated to reflect the new development.

11. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 121 - 192)

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period 26/02/2024 – 17/05/2024.

12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

13. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

To note the date of the next meeting is 20th June.