

MINUTES OF THE MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Wednesday, 17th July, 2024, 7:00pm – 8:40pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Lester Buxton, Sean O'Donovan, Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, Emine Ibrahim, Alexandra Worrell and Luke Cawley-Harrison

ALSO ATTENDING: Kodi Sprott, Principal Committee Coordinator, Robbie McNaugher, Head Of Development Management and Enforcement, Matthew Barrett, Senior Legal Officer, Richard Truscott, Principal Urban Design Officer, Rob Krzyszowski, Assistant Director Planning Buildings and Sustainability, Philip Elliot, Principal Planning Officer, Gareth Prosser, Deputy Team Manager, Maurice Richards, Head Of Transport and Travel, John McRory, Principal Planning Office

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 for absence have been received from Cllr Emery and Cllr Bartlett. Cllr Cawley-Harrison was in attendance as his substitute in accordance with committee standing orders 53-56.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Bevan declared an interest in regard to item 8 as he met with Spurs on a regular basis, this would not affect his judgement and he would be viewing the item with an open mind. Cllr Ibrahim declared an interest in regard to item 8 as she was a member of ASA, she would be viewing the item with an open mind. She also declared an interest for item 10 as she is a ward councillor for Noel Park, she would be viewing this item with an open mind.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 8th July as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2024/0692 807 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 8ER

Phillip Elliot, planning officer introduced the report for Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a replacement building of up four storeys to include purpose built student accommodation (Sui Generis) and flexible commercial, business and service uses (Class E), hard and soft landscaping, and associated works.

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

- There was no policy reason as to why the dentist would have been required, this idea was proposed by the applicant.
- The intention was to provide onsite affordable housing or affordable housing within the neighbouring depot site.
- The London Plan H15 student policy essentially talks about having the option of the accommodation being used outside the academic year for certain groups to improve viability of the accommodation. In that particular part of the policy it refers to delegates, interns on university placements and students on short term education courses.
- The potential of a change to multiple occupancy would be a change of use application that officers would have control over. There is a nominations agreement in the section 10 and evidence to show there was a demand for student accommodation. Furthermore, there is a letter of support from university institutions which detailed that they supported the scheme and would like to take up the accommodation.
- On affordable housing, the applicant had other land holdings within the same site allocation. Therefore, there was potential to provide conventional affordable housing within a site close by. Whilst it was London plan policy compliant to provide affordable student accommodation within it, there was also the other option where it could potentially provide for Haringey residents.
- In terms of archaeology, comments were made previously under the last application and two conditions were settled on. The archaeological advisors from Greater London Archaeological service have said that if you members were to grant planning permission again, then these conditions needed to be reapplied.
- Condition 27 required the parking space to have an electric vehicle charging point. It also required details of the allocation and management of the disabled parking space. In terms of sufficient space on Percival Court, the applicants had sought to make as much space possible.
- In terms of the affordable aspect outside of term time. Officers had largely looked at this based on the supporting text in policy H15 and the London plan. There could be difficulties of viability, being able to keep this open at a time where there might be groups of people leaving would give officers a buffer for the running of the building to have that additional income. There was not any policy requirement or text that says

that should be retained at a level akin to the actual student accommodation in terms of a percentage being affordable

- In terms of demand for student accommodation, the London plan displayed a lot of evidence behind this and shows that there was growing demand for purpose built student accommodation in London. A few years ago an evidence based document called the Strategic Housing Market Assessment looked at the housing service and the need for housing and accommodation across the borough for different types of people and communities – this included student accommodation. The number of private households which comprised of only students had nearly doubled since 2011. There was very significant growth in the number of students occupying private sector dwellings.

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

- On the previous application, the applicant was in negotiations with the Dentist practice which occupied 802 High Road. It wasn't clear whether they were going to relocate them into this scheme or whether the practice was going to relocate elsewhere.
- The change in affordable housing arose from a negotiation that was currently going on between the club, the Council and Lend Lease. This looked at the increase of affordable within the goods yard depot from the current percentage of 35% up to potentially 41%, which would allow the accelerated decants of the Love Lane estate and the acceleration of the High Road West scheme overall.
- On the concierge, some of this would come down to the PBSA operator that would be appointed. There was currently a short list of two, but the understanding was that they would try and operate this as a satellite to the main Print Works scheme; extending to security and having concierge's 24 hours day.
- The plan was to attract universities to Haringey, this was not just about accommodation. The applicant would like students to be studying and living in the borough at the same time.
- The library service had been one of the biggest beneficiaries of Community Infrastructure Levy. There was no reason to suggest that this would not continue in future decisions.
- Cllr Collett noted that there was wonder if there was going to be so much student accommodation, whether actually as part of the social infrastructure, members should be thinking about returning care leavers.
- By providing both cycle parking and the accessible parking space on Percival Court, it removed the ability to service waste and refuse. From an operational management and safety point of view, this would have to be via the established route previously for the residential. This had been accepted by officers and there were conditions imposed on the consent to have a waste management plan secured and agreed.
- There was a condition which would require a car parking management plan to be worked up and agreed with officers detailing how that space would function and how it would be allocated to on-site users.
- There was a delivery and service plan condition that would require consideration of all aspects of safe and legal loading deliveries. There was a loading bay on the High Road which was found to be sufficient enough to service the site.
- In regard to dockless E bikes, this would be looked at within planning policies to build this in the future. The provision of cycle parking for both the student and commercial accommodation was viewed to be sufficient.

- There was no agreed fall-back time on where it would default to the payment in lieu if the offsite allocation was agreed but then doesn't come forward. Officers felt five years was appropriate to give time to get some sort of agreement in place on that.

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 10 for, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission, impose conditions and informatives, and sign a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.

That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution 2.1 above is to be completed no later than 15 August 2024 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement (Head of DM) or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability (AD Planning) shall in their sole discretion allow.

That, following completion of the agreement referred to in resolution 2.) 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.

That delegated authority be granted to the Head of DM or AD Planning to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions and informatives 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 Planning Sub Committee.

Conditions Summary – (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 2 of this report).

- 1) 3-year time limit**
- 2) Development to be in accordance with approved plans.**
- 3) Contract for replacement building (Blocks A and B) before demolition of existing building**
- 4) Accessible Accommodation**
- 5) BREEAM Accreditation**
- 6) Block A – Noise Attenuation 1**
- 7) Blocks A & B – Noise Attenuation 2**
- 8) Mechanical Plant Noise**
- 9) Tree retention**
- 10) Landscape Details**
- 11) Building User Guide**
- 12) Drainage - Design Implementation, Maintenance, and Management**
- 13) External Materials and Details**
- 14) No Plumbing on outside of buildings**
- 15) No grills on outside of Block A**
- 16) Secured by Design**
- 17) Fire Statement**
- 18) Energy Strategy**

- 19)Overheating
- 20)MVHR
- 21)Land Contamination – Part 1
- 22)Land Contamination – Part 2
- 23)Unexpected Contamination
- 24)Archaeology 1
- 25)Archaeology 2
- 26)Cycle Parking Provision
- 27)Car Parking Provision
- 28)Delivery and Service Plan
- 29)Student and Commercial Waste Management Plans
- 30)Construction Logistics Plan
- 31)Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans
- 32)Impact Piling Method Statement
- 33)Business and Community Liaison
- 34)Telecommunications
- 35)Water Efficiency Condition

9. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

The Chair referred to the note on pre-application briefings and this information was noted.

10. PPA/2024/0023 25-27 CLARENDON ROAD N8 0DD

John McRory, Principal Planning Officer introduced the report for Redevelopment of the site consisting of the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a mixed-use scheme comprising workspace and co-living accommodation.

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

- On the maximum stay of three years, the planning policy stipulated a minimum stay of three months maximum of three years. In terms of the 49 homes, that was an estimate and the purpose of it was to give an indication of the fact that there was the opportunity for existing homes that were HMO's to be freed up. There was a significant demand for rented properties. There was the risk of further properties that could end up being converted into HMO's and this scheme had the capacity to be able to reduce that.
- All studios would have a kitchenette, and everyone would have access to the shared kitchen.
- Concerns were raised about the design lacked a homely aspect, this would be taken away and discussed with the design team.
- There was a community consultation event where 900 local properties were invited. This event did not have a high turnout as there were only 10 attendees but all feedback on this proposal was positive.
- This application was designed to be in line with HMO's, rent would always be the same.
- The commercial space would pay business rates.
- At the first QRP panel, the cycles and the bin store were at the southern end. Their concerns were that people bringing their cycles in or taking the bins out was going to disturb the piece of public realm. For the second design review panel, the applicant put together a comparison of the size of the space with the spaces further up along in

Clarendon Square. That allowed them to understand that they were offering a decent sized space.

- This would be a car free development and within the lease residents would not be able to own a car.
- This development wasn't solely for single occupancy.
- Single aspect units would be daylight tested. Residents would have access to many other communal rooms.

11. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 1ST August .

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by Chair

Date