

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 were received from Cllr Worrell, Cllr Bartlett and Cllr Rice.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Cllr Bevan declared an interest as the proposed scheme for item 9 was within his ward. He had also made observational comments on this item but did not believe that these would impact the decision made. He would view the item with an open mind.
- Councillor O'Donovan declared an interest for item 8 as he was ward councillor for Tottenham Hale. He would approach the item with an open mind.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED

To approve the minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held on the 1st August and 9th September as a correct record.

Cllr Bevan noted that the index linked sum of £4000 was not mentioned in the minutes, planning officers explained that they would use this point to negotiate the Section 106 with Spurs.

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2023/3078 TOTTENHAM HALE STATION, LONDON UNDERGROUND LTD, STATION ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 9LR (PAGES 13 - 104)

Planning Officer, Robbie McNaugher introduced the item for section 73 application to vary Conditions 1 and 11 of the approved development (application ref. HGY/2018/1897 which amended the original permission HGY/2013/2610 for changes to the works to extend the operational railway station at Tottenham Hale). The variations are to replace the requirement of providing a new station entrance and footbridge from Hale Village to Tottenham Hale Station, to instead requiring pedestrian and cycle network improvements on Ferry Lane and accessory works.

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

- There would be a lip and a difference in materials, this would delineate the cycle way from the foot way. This met design standards and would be subject to a stage one, stage two and stage 3 road safety order.
- TFL have done extensive modelling and looked at the impacts on increased capacity. For example, on match days passenger levels had been looked at closely.
- In terms of costs there has not been a budget to secure the link bridge. This was incredibly expensive compared to what the applicant initially expected. The option to have a paid link was looked at, but this would have to be staffed. Officers had taken into consideration the slight increase to the overall footway width. The current cycle lanes were not in line with standards. This scheme had been optimised given an understanding of the financial constraints.
- The floating bus stop was a reasonable distance from the bridge itself, the bus stop was an island within a cycle lane and a road. There were new standards published by TFL regarding a bus stop bypass. Officers would take consideration into the design to slow cyclists down before the bypass. This design would go through the network management team at TFL and safety auditors.
- Lighting would be part of the safety design, officers would give more attention to the detailed design of this.

Quentin Given represented the Ferry Lane Action Group. He attended the committee and spoke in objection of this proposal; a summary of his speech is below:

Quentin welcomed the proposal for a new crossing and widening of footway, he also supported reducing the speed limit to 20mph. His specific concern was about the conflict on the southside of the road between pedestrians and cyclists, particularly large electric and delivery bikes. He was also concerned about phone theft in the area. He was disappointed that the suggestion of changing the staggered crossing had been rejected.

Andrew Johnson, the Director of Engine Room Community Centre attended the committee and spoke in objection of this proposal, a summary of his speech is below:

The proposal for a link bridge was heavily supported by residents. This area had an overcrowded, dangerous footpath with an influx of pedestrians and cyclists. He requested that the team share plans for the bridge as per the original planning permission and find funding required to provide a fully accessible eastern entrance to Tottenham Hale station.

Cllr Peacock, Ward Councillor for South Tottenham attended the committee and spoke in objection of this proposal, a summary of her speech is below:

Cllr Peacock was concerned about pedestrian and cyclist safety, she appealed to members to go to the area to assess the situation and reflect on what the proposal was seeking.

The following was noted in response to questions to objectors:

- In the objector's view, cyclists took little consideration of the cycling lane and the pavements were narrow. The Met Police had met with students and spoke about theft in the area. There was also an issue with E bikes on this foot path.
- Objectors felt that the local population had not been engaged in the process of this scheme.
- Officers explained that dropped kerbs were trip hazards and the materials for a lip were a standard. Drop kerbs could cause issues for the visually impaired.
- The deadline for usage of this funding had been extended from last year. TFL remained committed to collaboration on a plan of a link bridge or a suitable alternative.

Matthew Yates TFL, Head of Projects, Consents and Urban Design TFL attended the committee and spoke in support of this proposal. The following was noted from this speech:

- The link bridge was originally intended to improve connectivity across the railway, it was not required to address capacity. TfL had secured £4 million to provide an alternative to the previous scheme. If costings were cut down on this, money could be spent on the wider environment, funding could be for wayfinding signage, particularly along Ferry Lane, but also in surrounding areas.
- The cycle lane at the moment was not of the correct standard, the barrier was between the cyclists and the pedestrians and not the cyclists in the road. Cyclists did not feel safe using those cycleways and that's why there are cyclists and E cyclists using the pavement. This proposal had been supported by road safety audits.
- TFL were pleased that the pedestrian crossing proposed at the junction with the bus station was welcomed. The bus stop bypass again had been through a stage 1 audit. TFL had published a review which could be sent to the committee. Their research had found that they were safe for all road users, including bus passengers. Casualty data indicated that there was a low risk of a pedestrian being injured by someone cycling at a bus stop.
- There were targeted stakeholder engagement exercises with Ferry Lane Action Group, Haringey officers and cycling groups. TFL could not guarantee that funding would be available next year for this scheme.

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

- The proposed application in 2013 was for an improved station, TFL were not precluding a link bridge in the future.
- There was an opportunity to make improvements in the area and TFL wanted to work with the Council to ensure this happened
- TFL believed the proposal was safe and there was a road safety audit to prove this.
- TFL cannot guarantee the funding for this will be available next year

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 rejected following a vote with 3 for, 4 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Committee **rejected** the proposal for planning permission. The reason for this was on the basis of local plan strategic policy SP7 for transport which was about promoting road safety and pedestrian movement.

POST MEETING NOTE FOR AGREEMENT

Based on the concerns raised during the discussion the reason for refusal shall be as follows:

The proposal would fail to support Haringey's regeneration and local access to London, provide the level of improvements to the Tottenham Hale interchange without sufficient mitigation through improvements to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and road safety contrary to Strategic Policies SP7 of the Local Plan.

9. HGY/2024/1450 ARUNDEL COURT AND BALDEWYNE COURT, LANSDOWNE ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON, N17 0LR (PAGES 105 - 168)

Planning Officer, Kwaku-Bossman Gyamera introduced the item for redevelopment of existing car parking area to both Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court to provide 30 residential units over 4 blocks of three storeys with associated amenity space, refuse/recycling and cycle stores. Reconfiguration of parking area accessed off Lansdowne Road, provision of additional communal amenity space, new cycle facilities and replacement refuse/recycling facilities. Enhanced landscaping across Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court.

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

- Both schemes provided dual aspect and triple aspect units. There were kitchen-diners within the scheme. Bulk storage would be provided on both schemes, this was separate to resident waste disposal.
- There had been a parking survey carried out, and there was off-street parking available. 10 out of 32 spaces were not used in Arundel and 10 out of 31 in Baldwyn were not used. There was scope for further spaces and sufficient capacity within the local area. Residents could apply for permits however new residents could not apply as this development would be a car free development.

Rorie Ash, Resident of Baldwyn Court attended the committee to speak in objection to this proposal. The following was noted from his speech:

Rorie explained he had submitted an objection letter in June and in his view his concerns had not been taken into account. He believed the layouts of the existing flats were not considered properly. His kitchen was an independent room and held a view of 40m down Lansdowne road, this development would obstruct this view. The new blocks would require steel gates, he was concerned about the noise implications from these. The new bin stores would be accessed through the alleyway, bin stores should be external.

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

- Officers did not consider the kitchen windows particularly beneficial to the existing dwellings because they were quite small high-level windows.
- New steel gates and new steel fences would be installed, officers were confident they would be rarely used, and the Council could make sure that they were fitted with rubber pads to prevent them from making too much noise.
- BRE guide does not expect the applicant to know the internal layout of neighbouring buildings. The standards were based on neighbouring windows, the existing neighbouring windows achieved excellent daylight and sunlight levels.
- With the Neighbourhood Move scheme, existing residents within the given area would have a degree of priority.
- Noise baffling on high quality materials was provided and materials would be subject to planning conditions.
- During the evolution of this scheme, the view was taken that if there were internal bins stores, these would take up less space. It was simply about trying to maximise the amount of public realm and landscaping which was available to the existing residents in the future.
- Housing officers could look to consult with residents in the existing blocks to identify whether there were circumstances in which the location of the bin stores could be the subject of a separate later application. Housing officers would undertake this as part of the co-production exercise. However, more fundamental changes to the design could not be held subject to a planning condition.
- The scheme had been to the Quality Review Panel.

- The contractual obligations for the subsequent contractors require that there would be a two year period during which those contractors post completion undertake a full maintenance of all landscaping for the subsequent 3 year periods. The housing delivery team would undertake the maintenance and upkeep of those newly planted landscaped areas.
- Housing officers had a governance process that required them to report back to Cabinet and ultimately to full Council on the outcome of all schemes after the rectification period, roughly 2 years post completion. The fundamental part of that exercise is that officers undertake a survey of as many residents.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report. He noted including a condition for landscaping at point for noise mitigation for gates. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted following a vote with 8 for, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED

1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to an agreement providing for the measures set out in the Heads of Terms below.
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.
3. That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 8/01/2025 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in his sole discretion allow; and
4. 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 be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions

1. Time limit
2. Drawings
3. Materials and elevations
4. Landscaping
5. External lighting
6. Secure by design accreditation
7. Land Contamination
8. Unexpected Contamination
9. Construction Environmental Management Plan
10. Arboricultural Impact Assessment
11. Tree Protection Measures
12. Cycle parking
13. Disabled parking bays

14. Car Parking Management Plan
15. Delivery and servicing Plan and Waste Management
16. Satellite antenna
17. Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
18. Piling Method Statement
19. Energy strategy
20. Overheating
21. Living roofs
22. Biodiversity
23. Urban Greening Factor
24. Sustainable Design and Construction

Informatives

- 1) Co-operation
- 2) CIL liable
- 3) Hours of construction
- 4) Party Wall Act
- 5) Street Numbering
- 6) Sprinklers
- 7) Water pressure
- 8) Asbestos
- 9) Secure by design
- 10) Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit

10. UPDATE ON MAJOR PROPOSALS (PAGES 169 - 170)

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.

11. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS (PAGES 293 - 336)

To advise the Planning Committee of decisions on planning applications taken under delegated powers for the period 26.08.24 – 27.09.24.

12. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

13. DATE OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The next meeting is scheduled for 7th November.