

Planning Sub Committee, 1st August, 7:00 – 9:30

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 Worrell and Cllr Collett.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Bevan declared an interest regarding item 8 as he was ward councillor, he also regularly attended BCLG meetings and commented on event management; he would view the item with an open mind. Cllr O Donovan was vice chair of the Alexandra Palace and Park Board and would consider the item with an open mind. Cllr Ibrahim was Chair of the Alexandra Park and Palace board and held an Arsenal membership, Cllr Rice had attended some BCLG meetings.

6. MINUTES

TO FOLLOW

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 17th July as a correct record.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2024/1008 TOTTENHAM HOTSPUR STADIUM, 748 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 0AL (PAGES 1 - 178)

John McRory, Team Manager introduced the report for minor Material Amendment application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for the variation to Condition B9 (Major Non association Football Events) (MNFES) of the hybrid planning permission HGY/2023/2137 (as amended from HGY/2015/3000) for amendments to allow up to 30 major non-association football events including music concerts; and other associated changes.

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

- The section 106 agreement secures £1000 for regulatory services and then £1000 for noise monitoring. This was £2000 of the £4000 ASB recommendation, officers looked at this with the club and found that £2000 was a reasonable position to recommend on that.

- The LAMP was a live document and tailored for each event taking place. Officers were working on a football LAMP, a LAMP for NFL and a LAMP for boxing. In terms of the monitoring proposal report, this report was quite comprehensive and officers could circulate this members.
- The review mechanism sought to strike the right balance between giving some certainty to allow the club to programme in future events, but also control those events and secure any mitigation that would be needed to address any concerns that come through. Given it's a S106 obligation and require consideration of those issues, it would be delegated to officers.
- Most events would have a capacity of 40,000 but there could be smaller events.
- Officers were satisfied that the proposal had a good balance of benefits against the potential impact on residents. To vary the area of where tickets were allocated geographically would be complex.
- The £30,000 per year was coming to the Council to resource input in terms of reviewing the travel plan, local management plan and the monitoring proposal document. The club had a separate mechanism to procure staff and marshalls.
- Toilet signage on events day had been improved.
- Boxing events would hold a larger capacity than a concert. Safety arrangements and the set up does limit concerts to a certain capacity, officers did not for see that this would change. Licensing mechanisms looked at the issues of safety and there was a safety advisory group.
- The Waste Service had commented on this proposal and has confirmed that there was a satisfactory agreement already in place for non-football events. The club would pay the Council's costs and its own contractors for doing a clear up after the major non-football events. That was actively monitored by the Council and there was no objection from waste services on that matter for this application.
- Regulatory matters included noise, ASB community safety, environmental health trading standards and licencing. Regulatory Services' request was based on some of the events that they had attended. It was a full-on operation and there were a mixture of different issues that tended to happen, it did have a direct effect upon the Council's revenue accounts in order to be able to regulate those things. Therefore, officers had to manage and restrict the number of officers who were available in order to mitigate the issues, because the council simply did not have the budget in order to do it. The suggested contribution is £1000 for regulatory services and £1000 for noise. What was originally requested was £4000 which included noise, so effectively this was the contribution as is half and the services response to that would be they would respond to half of the things of which were now being funded for.
- There were different issues for different events, there would be an assessment carried out on which is the highest priority or risks.

Cllr Ali attended the committee to speak on this application:

- Cllr Ali had made observations on this application. He noted that the application was contentious within the community – there being 60 comments on the application alone, Events would have an impact on the densely populated area and there was a need for specialists to assess this, he queried whether the Council had the resource and funding to do so. He raised the point of there being a further condition for this and also the need for a slightly revised higher number of tickets for residents.

The following questions were noted from the committee to Cllr Ali:

- For every 3 objectors there was 1 supporter, residents had different concerns on this. Cllr Ali held the view that a lot of things should have been put in place before the application came to the committee. Members should have seen the LAMP document before the application. Bus routes and littering were a recurring complaint from residents.
- Cllr Ali thought the club should use their good grace to reconsider the figure of tickets made available for residents.
- Timeline of LAMP should be completed and date for this should be provided. Officers should rethink in terms of waste footprint.

The following was noted in response to Cllr Ali from the Applicant:

The £1000 contribution to noise monitoring will apply to all concerts. Officers provided a breakdown of where the regulatory services money might be spent and the elements impacting preventing antisocial behaviour and street drinking were deemed to be a priority over weights and measures. The applicant was happy to increase the contribution to £2000 for additional events (in addition to the £1k noise) to address members concerns around constraints with resourcing. The applicant further pointed out that whilst capacity has doubled, business rates have quadrupled. On the tickets, the 100 tickets being provided to residents is expressed as a minimum, but to date this has been an average of approximately 200 tickets provided per event. In addition to free tickets there is the advance ticket window for local residents. The applicant was willing to review the postcodes for accessing this service in order to make sure that residents most effected benefit. and would consider a drive time isochrone or radius around the stadium.

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

- The club would always try to exceed the minimum number of tickets provided to residents, but this would vary from event to event. There would be an advanced ticket window for residents and residents impacted most would be prioritised, the applicant was open to looking at a wider radius around the stadium.
- The applicant was held to account by officers on cycling infrastructure. Secure cycle parking hadn't been taken up massively. Lime bikes were being looked at and the team were working with officers to ensure safety.

Cllr Rice put forward a motion in relation to members not receiving enough detail, specifically the LAMP document not being made available. Cllr O' Donovan seconded this motion.

This followed a vote of 0 for, 0 against and 0 in abstention.

It was reiterated to members there was an approved LAMP in place, with 7 approved for different types of events. Officers were consulting on a review to this, there were not huge changes to this. The Council had ultimate control of this through the licensing process. There were special BCLG meeting's to engage on LAMP and officers were committed to further engagement of this. LAMP was a live document and there was an annual review of this, with this came an action plan.

It was noted that there would be updates to the heads of terms; in section 2.4 an increase of 2k, point 8 of heads of terms to be amended to an appropriate radius of the stadium.

Cllr Bevan put forward an additional condition for £4000 to be paid for every additional 16 events to contribute towards supporting staff and administrative costs. With the club's agreement officers amended the overall obligation for regulatory services, this would be £3000 for regulatory services and £1000 for noise monitoring. This would produce a total of £4000. The recommendation would be updated to reflect this and would be everything in excess of the 16 events. Following this agreement, Cllr Bevan withdrew his motion.

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 9 for, 0 against and 0 abstentions

9. PRE-APPLICATION BRIEFINGS

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

10. PPA/2020/0013 THE SELBY CENTRE, 1 SELBY RD, LONDON N17 8JL (DEVELOPMENT INCLUDES BULL LANE PLAYING FIELDS, BULL LANE, LONDON N18 1SX LOCATED WITHIN THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD) (PAGES 179 - 228)

Philip Elliott introduced the report for the Selby Urban Village Project seeks the delivery of a new and replacement Selby Centre, 202 new homes for social rent, new and enhanced indoor and outdoor sport and leisure facilities, new children's play facilities, new pedestrian and cycle connections, and new tree planting and ecological enhancements.

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

- There would be cricket pitches on this site and the applicant was looking at opportunity for provision of other uses.
- There would be two separate planning applications for Enfield and Haringey. The Enfield planning application would be for sports and the sports hall.
- Officers were looking to start the application as soon as possible; the aim was to get on site by the middle of next year.
- There was consideration to make the storey taller, however the applicant redesigned this due to fire regulations and these not being economical.
- There was a QRP panel meeting last year and constant dialogue throughout this process. There were no plans to go back to this panel.
- The applicant was directly engaged with the ECB. This would be a full size cricket field with an artificial pitch in the middle, the ECB were supportive and would further invest.
- There would be green roofs which were solar panelled, there would be generous courtyard space, some of which would be private.
- There was a chairs review on this proposal in February 2022.