

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

Councillors: Basu, Beacham, Christophides, Demirci (Chair), Egan, Hare, Mallett, McNamara, Reid and Scott

Also Present: Councillors Bevan, Diakides, Schmitz, Strickland and Vanier

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PC177.	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Peacock, for whom Cllr Egan was acting as substitute, from Cllr Schmitz, for whom Cllr Hare was acting as substitute and from Cllr Solomon for whom Cllr Scott was acting as substitute.</p>	
PC178.	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>	
PC179.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Cllr Mallett declared a personal interest as she lived within half a mile of the site and was a member of Tynemouth Residents Association.</p>	
PC180.	<p>WARDS CORNER SITE, HIGH ROAD, N15</p> <p>Paul Smith gave a presentation on key aspects of the report, which set out details and images of the proposal, details of the site and surroundings, planning history, relevant planning policy, consultation and responses, analysis, human rights and equalities considerations and recommended that the planning application be granted, subject to conditions, s106 legal agreement and the direction of the Mayor of London, and also that Conservation Area Consent be granted, subject to a condition.</p> <p>Mr Smith advised the Committee of a number of representations received since the report had been written, including from SAVE Britain's Heritage, the Wards Corner Community Coalition, the Joint Conservation Advisory Committee, Federation of Small Businesses, Councillor Diakides and Cllr Schmitz. In total, an additional 319 additional letters of objection had been received as of 3pm on 25 June. 2 additional letters of support had also been received, and a 'Proud of Tottenham' petition including at least 200 signatures had been submitted by Cllr Peacock. A letter of representation had been received from the GLA subsequent to the report being produced and requested an addition to the s106 agreement stating that the market currently on-site cannot be closed until a temporary location was found, with the GLA signatory to a schedule containing this clause. This addition to the s106 agreement was recommended by officers as part of the overall recommendations of the report.</p> <p>Committee Members had been supplied with a document outlining changes to</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

the officers' report (appended to the minutes), made in line with legal advice. Mr Smith talked the Committee through the changes, and took questions from the Committee on the report and presentation.

The following points were raised in response to questions from Members to officers:

- With regard to the Council's defence of the decision to refuse the previous application, Mr Smith and Mr Ledden advised that, as officers had recommended approval of the previous scheme, external consultants had been engaged to support the reasons for refusal. The appeal against the decision to refuse and the Council's defence of that decision was currently in progress.
- It was confirmed that there was public toilet provision in Apex House, and that public toilets were proposed in the internal market area of the scheme.
- In respect of the impact on light levels for residents on Suffield Road, it was confirmed that the current scheme did not differ from the previous scheme proposed.
- The number of disabled parking spaces proposed had been calculated in accordance with the UDP and London Plan.
- Allan Ledden, Legal Officer, advised the Committee of their duties under the Equality Act 2010, which were to, in the exercise of their functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Equality Act 2010, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. In order to ensure that such obligations were fulfilled, an independent EqIA (Equalities Impact Assessment) had been commissioned from URS, looking at those who were likely to be affected by the proposals, and the mitigation measures put forward.
- In respect of the mitigation proposed in relation to the EqIA, it was reported that the provisions in respect of support for the market were greater than in the previous scheme, as it was now a requirement under the s106 agreement for there to be a market facilitator and there was also the offer of broader business support. It was a further stipulation that the market could not be closed until a temporary location had been identified.
- Mr Ledden advised the Committee that the application granted in 2008 had been overturned not on the basis that the mitigation proposed had been inadequate but on a procedural error in that there had been no specific reference to the duties under the (then) Race Relations Act.
- The assistance proposed to the market traders included the opportunity for traders to relocate to a temporary offsite location together during construction, the opportunity to return to the new market, although at higher rental rates than previously and a £144k assistance fund for relocation.
- In response to a question from the Committee about the rental increase, indicated in the report as being from £31 per sq ft to £90 per sq ft, it was confirmed that the current rental values were

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

commensurate with the quality of the existing facilities, and the proposed higher value would reflect the new buildings, increased footfall to the area and the larger business and retail space.

- It was reported that between 2004 and 2006 the market presence at the site had become stronger, and it had been accepted at the time of the first application that the market should be retained at this location.
- TfL and Grainger would have the responsibility for maintenance of the public square proposed for the Tottenham High Road frontage of the site.
- Trade waste from the shops on West Green Road and waste from the residential units above the shops would be retained within the service area in the proposed site for collection, and would not be left on the street.
- The proposals for a cycle superhighway were being developed in conjunction with the proposals in this application, and it was therefore confirmed that there was no potential impact on the planned public space as a result of the introduction of the cycle superhighway.
- It was anticipated that there would be an increase in footfall at the site as a result of the improved quality of the local environment, and due to the increase in the retail offer and the number of residential units in the area.
- In relation to the support offered to residents who would be affected by the proposed development, it was confirmed that the Council would use its role and powers as a Housing Authority to assist those affected.
- It was confirmed that the proposal to return the southern end of Suffield Road to 2-way traffic, to allow service vehicles to access the site, would be funded by means of an appropriate section 278 agreement.
- The Committee expressed concern regarding the proposal that the assistance for the market should run for a 5-year period from the date of consent, rather than the date of commencement of the development. Marc Dorfman, Assistant Director, Planning Regeneration and Economy, agreed that this was an issue that could be addressed by means of condition, were the Committee minded to grant the application.
- The UDP, regeneration strategies for Tottenham and planning brief all indicated an ambition for a greater balance of housing mix in the area, with sustainable communities particularly at key growth and improvement sites. The aim was to bring in new investment to complement existing communities.

The Committee heard from 11 objectors to the application – the number of people registering to object in the first instance had exceeded the likely time permissible for the meeting and, after deliberation, the objectors had agreed that these 11 speakers would represent the views of the wider group. The Chair indicated that the objectors would have a total of 30 minutes in which to make their representations to the Committee.

Cllr Demirci declared a personal interest at this point in proceedings, as he had become aware that he was related to one of the objectors, and had not been aware of this fact previously.

The following points were raised by the objectors in addressing the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

Committee, and in responding to questions from Committee Members:

- The 1909 department store building was a rare and remarkable survival, and contributed positively to the unique character of the area. Objectors concurred with English Heritage's view that the scheme would be damaging to the Conservation Area as it would result in the loss of this rare, early 20th century building.
- Markets and small businesses were the key drivers of regeneration at a local, sustainable level; heritage-led regeneration schemes had been very successful elsewhere.
- Objectors stated that the 2004 planning brief was now out of date, and questioned the viability, desirability and support for this proposal.
- The changes made since the previous scheme were felt to be for the worse, for example the colour of the brickwork, which was felt to echo the nearby Tesco.
- Objectors supported regeneration of Wards Corner, but not this proposal.
- It was felt that this scheme had been rushed through since the previous refusal, particularly given the sensitivity of the location in respect of cultural heritage.
- The bulk, massing and design of the scheme, cited as reasons for refusal of the previous scheme, were still felt to be issues with the new proposal. Concerns in this regard had been raised by the Design Panel, who had overall concluded that the scheme was too bland. The reduction in height was not felt to be adequate, and the proposed use of glass for the upper storey was identified as an additional concern.
- The harm caused by the loss of the buildings within the Conservation Area, including two locally-listed buildings, was not felt to outweigh the benefits of the scheme – the proposal would downgrade the value of the Conservation Area, whereas development on this site should enhance and positively relate to the wider area.
- The previous scheme had been refused permission on conservation grounds, and the same issues arose from this application, which was felt to cause irreparable damage to the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area was small, and so the harm caused as a result of this proposal would be substantial.
- Objectors felt that the proposed memory boxes would do nothing to mitigate the proposed loss of the valuable heritage assets on the site.
- It was felt that, were the brick used the same as the existing Edwardian buildings, this would make a positive difference in the appearance of the proposed scheme.
- The objectors felt that the proposals put forward by the Wards Corner Community Coalition, with the retention of as much of the existing buildings as possible, would be the best solution for regeneration of the site.
- In response to a question regarding the importance of the heritage of ethnic diversity at the site, objectors indicated that Committee Members should have regard to their duties under the Equality Act and weigh up such matters in reaching their decision.
- Objectors felt that for the proposal to constitute a gateway to Seven Sisters, it needed to be something distinctive and special – what was already there, but properly looked after and enhanced, would be an

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

appropriate gateway, and would relate to its surroundings in a more sympathetic manner than the scheme proposed.

- Objectors clarified that their reference to the planning brief being out of date was that it adopted an old approach to development in respect of the demolition of historic buildings.
- An objector advised that she was being forced to leave her home and business of 30-years standing as a result of the development, and that Grainger were misusing their position as landlord. The level of compensation proposed was too little, and there was no offer of a new unit in the completed development. Existing tenants were not being treated with respect in this process, and that it was for the Council to protect local residents and small traders. Residents wished for the improvement to the area, but felt it was not fair for this to be at their own personal cost.
- National businesses had previously closed branches in this area, and it had been small, local, businesses who had persevered and contributed to the area's regeneration in recent years. Objectors felt that Grainger and the national companies who had previously abandoned the area would be the only ones to benefit as a result of this development. Several small business had been trading on the site for more than 25 years, and their commitment to the area was not reflected in this proposal.
- An objector who ran a business on West Green Road advised that he had participated in the survey undertaken by ComRes, but that this had not been relevant to Suffield Road, West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road, and had only related to the indoor market. He had advised that the questions were not relevant to him personally.
- In response to a question about whether small business would wish to return to the site if redeveloped, one objector stated that she would, if given the opportunity, while another advised that he would not wish to return to a situation where he was renting his premises, as he owned his existing unit outright.
- In an email from Tottenham Traders Partnership, read out by one of the objectors, concern was expressed that there was no support for local businesses and that this scheme was being pushed through, which would negatively affect local businesses and was undemocratic. There had been no genuine consultation with local people – the Council was meant to be made of local people, for local people, and everyone ought to be working together.
- Concern was expressed on the impact of the development on small businesses in the wider Tottenham area and across Haringey. The contribution of small businesses to the local economy was felt to be underestimated; if small businesses were disregarded by a development such as this, it could lead to a domino effect more widely.
- The indoor market had been there since the 1980s – asking the market traders to relocate would make them the equivalent of start-up businesses, with all the risks of failure that that entailed.
- Concern was raised that, in the current economic conditions, the development could be commenced but not completed.
- For long-term traders on the market, the uncertainty regarding their future had a negative impact. Customers had stated that they could not imagine life without the market, as it met very specific needs in the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

community. It was felt that Grainger did not understand who the market consisted of, what they did, or the need for the market to exist in the future.

- Traders urged the Committee to visit the market to really understand its value.
- Objectors felt that the relocation of the market was not a viable option, as by moving away from its established location, traders would be hit financially; there was a further risk that they would lose customers, and there was no guarantee that they could attract new customers or that the market would survive such a move. It was felt that for long-standing businesses, the compensation package offered was not fair, but that the greater issue was the cost to traders of relocating. It was likely that not all traders would be able or willing to move all together as a block, and this would impact on the overall level of compensation for each business.
- The Committee asked about the changing nature of the market since the 1980s, and it was confirmed that, over this period of time the market had evolved, and now offered a unique cultural experience. The Committee was urged to retain the existing character that the area was well-known for.

The Committee **RESOLVED** at 9.30pm to suspend standing orders to enable discussion of the present agenda item to continue past 10pm.

The Committee resumed hearing from the objectors to the scheme, and asking questions. The following points were raised:

- In response to a question from the Committee regarding how objectors saw this application compared with the previous application, objectors responded that they felt that the current application was as bad as the previous one.
- In response to a question from the Committee, traders confirmed that it would make a difference if guarantees could be offered to market traders and leaseholders in respect of all traders being able to move together to a single nearby location for a temporary market, with sufficient support funding available.
- Although the unique offer of the market meant that some customers may be willing to travel to a new location, the market benefited from its existing location close to the underground station – there was a significant reduction in customers at times when trains were not running through the station, and therefore it was anticipated that there would be an even greater fall in customer numbers if the market were relocated further away from the station. There were additional concerns in respect of rents and unit costs for a relocated market site.
- Objectors felt that there was no need to neglect such a wonderful building, which had the potential for use by many small businesses, and that development should be driven by the local businesses and not an external developer.
- Concern was expressed that the scheme would negatively impact on the current diversity of businesses at the site, and that there was no guarantee that the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented. It was felt that the rental costs of the new units would be

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

excessive for small businesses and would prevent them from returning to the site.

- A local resident stated that the current scheme still did not adequately address equalities issues, both in terms of acknowledging the likely impact of the scheme and the extent of the discrimination that would result.
- The scheme was felt to be significantly the same as the previous, refused, scheme, and that many of the same issues in respect of heritage and the negative impact on the community remained unaddressed.
- The scheme would change the face of Tottenham forever, and would remove the opportunity for positive, heritage-led regeneration of the area.
- The argument for 'justifiable harm' was felt to be ridiculous, as the existing buildings in the area were beautiful. This scheme missed the opportunity to work with local people, and went against the principles of the new Localism Act, in that communities should have the opportunity to influence the future of the places they lived in.
- The Committee was asked to reverse the neglect shown to the site in recent years.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding why English Heritage had not offered funding for heritage at this site, objectors did not believe that the developer or Council had made any such approach to English Heritage. It was reported, however that the Princes Regeneration Trust had expressed an interest in the site, and that it was therefore incorrect to say that there was no interest from other bodies with regards to investing in the site.
- With regards to the equalities impact assessment, objectors felt that the document had not taken account of how badly local people felt they would be affected by the proposal, nor how different the proposed market would be from the existing market, which would lose its clientele and status as a community resource.

The Committee adjourned for 10 minutes at 9.50pm, and reconvened at 10pm.

The Committee heard from Councillor Diakides and Cllr Schmitz, who raised the following points in objection to the application and in responding to questions from the Committee:

- Everyone wanted to see regeneration at Wards Corner, but such a development would achieve the opposite and would blight the area rather than offering a way forward.
- Many people had expressed their concerns regarding the proposal.
- There had never been an application before the Planning Committee which was less suited for approval – the scheme failed in respect of architectural merit, sympathy to the Conservation Area, affordable housing, and was contrary to the Council's own policies.
- Local businesses at the site were thriving, and enabled 400 people to earn a living.
- The equalities impact assessment had to be taken into account by the Committee in reaching its decision.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

- The removal of a locally-listed building would inevitably damage the Conservation Area, and the Council itself was defending the appeal against the previous refusal on these grounds. This was a substantial objection, backed up by the NPPF.
- The Design Panel were all critical of the design.
- The argument regarding viability was based on a report which could not be seen due to commercially-sensitive information, which was wrong because: 1) the viability assessment should be applicable to any applicant, and not contain data exclusive relating to Grainger; 2) without seeing the report, it was not possible to know whether it covered all angles; 3) Under the planning framework, Grainger would be required to demonstrate i) nature of asset precludes all reasonable uses of site; ii) no viable use can be found in the medium term; iii) Grant funding or some other form of charitable public ownership is demonstrably not possible; iv) harm is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use. These were not felt to be the case in this instance, as the site was already in use, nobody had made any effort to seek external funding, and the benefits of the scheme were felt to be speculative at best.
- There was no way of holding Grainger to its commitment to provide a temporary market.
- Legal advice sought by the Wards Corner Community Coalition had been critical of the adequacy of the EqIA provided.
- In response to a question regarding the fact that the viability assessment was available to Members of the Committee, Cllr Schmitz advised that the main point was that there should be no need for the assessment to be confidential at all, as its findings should be applicable to any developer, and not contain commercial information specific to any one developer in particular.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding the representation made by Friends of the Earth that the present application was not materially different from the previous, refused, application, Cllr Schmitz advised that this was a valid point. Either way, were the scheme essentially the same as the previous scheme, there was a question as to why this hearing was taking place at all, or, were it significantly different, then there should have been more time allowed for a fuller assessment of its impacts to be undertaken.
- In response to a question regarding whether there were any way of improving the design of the proposed scheme, Cllr Schmitz advised that he did not feel that the scheme was remediable. The buildings on site should be retained, with the only justification for demolition being for a building of outstanding architectural quality.
- It was not felt that the proposed scheme would contribute to a sense of place in the area.
- Cllr Schmitz advised that in referring to heritage assets, he was referring to the Conservation Area as a whole, which would be damaged by the loss of locally-listed buildings within it.
- Cllr Schmitz felt that the hearing in respect of this application had been brought forward too quickly, and that it was unwise not to have waited until the outcome of the ongoing appeal.

The Committee heard from supporters of the application, who raised the

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012

following points in their presentations and in response to questions from the Committee:

- There were numerous problems in the area, which used to be a prestigious and high quality town centre; it was believed that this scheme would bring much-needed change to the area for the better and would complement other regeneration developments in the area.
- Regeneration so far in the area had been piecemeal.
- The most important issue was providing opportunities for young people in the area. This development would bring local jobs and opportunities for the whole community.
- The Council had to remember that it was accountable to the whole of Tottenham, and not individual agendas; there was a need for opportunities and regeneration for everyone.
- The area, which was among the 5-10% most deprived wards in the country, needed investment in order to develop opportunities and it was felt that this scheme would lead to directly- and indirectly-created jobs, as well as jobs during construction.
- It was acknowledged that the market was a tremendous asset for the area, and it was right that it should not be evicted until an alternative location had been found. In respect of the proposed increase in rents for the new market, it was proposed that assistance such as a period of discounted rent for the existing market traders on their return to the site could be an option.
- It was felt that the development would create a sense of place, and help to make the area somewhere that people could be proud of.
- It was felt that the development would create a gateway for the area, which was currently derelict.
- The key issues were identified as jobs and sustainability, and ensuring that local people were able to access jobs in their area.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding the impact of the development on the existing tenants, it was felt that there were matters to be addressed in respect of Compulsory Purchase Orders and compensation, but these were governed by legal processes. Gary Ince, of North London Business, indicated that his organisation would be willing to work with local businesses, and that it was important that businesses were supported during the construction process and assisted in returning to the site.
- There was an issue in respect of rents increasing, although traders would be returning to a high quality development.
- It was noted that there was social housing elsewhere in the area, and that there was a need for a mix of housing for the area to thrive.
- The development would enhance the lives of residents in Tottenham.
- In response to a question regarding the possibility of a renovation-type approach to development, supporters of the scheme felt that such an approach would not be appropriate, as there were concerns regarding the soundness of the existing buildings.
- The existing market was not physically accessible to everyone, particularly for those who had specific requirements in respect of mobility.
- The site had been in decline for many years, and this application was

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

an opportunity to kick-start regeneration in the area. It was felt that the existing buildings had little architectural merit.

- The proposed scheme was felt to offer a sense of restraint and simplicity, and drew the eye around the corner of the site to the focal point, which was the public plaza.
- It was felt that this was the right design for the site and employed solid, good quality materials such as brick and glass. It was interesting for a site above a station in that it was a heavily mixed-use development and was in line with a progressive regeneration strategy.
- This was felt to be a significant improvement on the previous scheme.

It was noted that two people who had registered to speak in support of the scheme had had to leave the meeting due to the lateness of the hour. The Committee heard from Cllr Strickland, Cllr Vanier and Cllr Bevan in support of the application. The following points were raised in their presentations to the Committee and responses to questions:

- There area needed a building that gave it the potential it deserved, and it was necessary to act in the best interests of all Tottenham residents.
- This development would help to deliver the ambitions of the people of Tottenham, ambitions which the Council had a duty to deliver. Local residents wanted a high street that they could shop at, with a better mix of local and national shops. Although there were concerns regarding national chains, it had been notable that the loss of national shops had led to a reduction in business in the local area, and bringing in such shops would enhance, and not damage, the viability of local traders.
- This was the only viable proposal for the area available.
- The scheme had taken into account and addressed the issues raised with the previous application, for example the height had been reduced, the façade had been redesigned and measures to mitigate the impact of the development had been introduced. The scheme also included provision for a much-needed fund for the improvement of West Green Road.
- People felt that the current state of deterioration of buildings in the area had contributed to negative feelings within the community.
- The scheme would help to address the issue of joblessness in the area, which had been identified as a key issue in the Young Foundation report commissioned after the riots in Tottenham in 2011.
- The Council had a duty to provide all types of housing, and there had been a large number of affordable social housing units built in the area in the past year or so. The development would provide 196 units for sale, to help to finance the development.
- In response to a question from the Committee regarding the issues facing those who would be displaced by the proposed development, it was recognised that the Council had a duty to support local businesses and that a compensation and support package was available, but that it was not possible to regenerate Tottenham without having an impact on the sites affected.
- In response to a question regarding whether more could have been done to engage with the local community regarding the future of the site, Cllr Strickland reported that the Council had met with both the Wards Corner Community Coalition and Grainger to discuss their

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012

respective proposals, and that the Grainger scheme was the only one which met the Council's vision for the site. This assessment had been based on a full consideration of both approaches.

- Lyn Garner advised, in response to a question from the Committee, that the issue of land ownership would not prevent an alternative application from coming forward.

Cllr Vanier gave apologies on behalf of her fellow ward Councillor, Cllr Richard Watson, who had been unable to attend the meeting due to a family commitment.

The Chair thanked everyone who had addressed the Committee, and also expressed gratitude to those observing from the gallery for their patience.

The applicants for the scheme addressed the Committee, and raised the following points in their presentations and in responding to questions from the Committee:

- The architects had worked with Grainger on several successful regeneration schemes in the borough, for example Hornsey Road Baths.
- The scheme had been designed with an emphasis on long term durability and sustainability, avoiding 'fashionable' styles to create something plain, simple and enduring. The materials used would be both beautiful and lasting, and this would be guaranteed by means of condition.
- The scheme had been criticised for changing the face of Tottenham, but this was precisely the intention of the proposed development.
- The conservation architect for the applicants had thoroughly researched the site and surrounding area, the history of development there and the development of the Conservation Area itself. It was felt that the character of this particular Conservation Area was very mixed, and there had been a significant degree of loss to the existing Victorian terrace. Original bay windows, dormers and chimneys had been lost, as well as around 50% of the original brickwork. The Wards building itself was not felt to be significant.
- The scale of the proposed development would be an improvement, as it would reduce the dominance of the road and create a sense of place.
- Seven Sisters was an area in need of change, as there were currently high levels of deprivation. There were three times as many vacant shops in the area currently as there were in 2007.
- This scheme would give a first impression to those arriving in the area by tube, and would lead to £65m of investment in Tottenham, as well as bringing increased business to local shops.
- Grainger were committed to delivering a new market, and also providing a temporary market and compensation for relocation costs.
- The Wards store had been vacant for 40 years, and the heritage value of the building had been overstated, in that it was not a steel-framed construction as had been claimed. There would be no

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012

substantial harm to the Conservation Area as a consequence of the scheme.

- A refurbishment-led regeneration approach would not achieve the regeneration aims for the area and would require unattainable public subsidy. There was still a viability gap in the alternative scheme proposed.
- The ComRes survey found that 76% of residents polled wanted mixed use on the site, but only 40% seemed to understand that the proposed scheme included a new market, suggesting that people may not have fully understood the proposal.
- The scheme would provide a significant level of new jobs.
- There was a proposed s106 clause prohibiting hot takeaway food outlets, betting shops or payday loan stores from occupying the new development.
- Over 400 people had expressed support for the development, and it was believed the Council was in the fortunate position of having the opportunity to deliver true regeneration for the area.
- In response to a question regarding claims that the changes to the previous scheme had been rushed through and lacked integrity, the applicants advised that there had been no rush in the way in which this scheme had been prepared, and that all amendments to the previous scheme had been as a result of careful consideration.
- David Walters, Grainger, advised that the market rental income would be approximately £185k pa. In response to a question regarding the possibility of offering existing traders a discount in rent for a period after their return to the new development, Mr Walters advised that if the Committee felt it to be necessary, the applicant would be willing to consider such an arrangement.
- The applicants emphasised the importance of the market to the scheme, and felt that the development would not attain its anticipated levels of success without the market being a part of it.
- It was confirmed that, regardless of any concessions offered, the rental of market space in the new development would be set at open market levels, and would therefore be affordable by definition.
- The Committee asked about the viability assessments undertaken, and the issues raised in respect of potential double-counting in the report undertaken by Cluttons. Mr Walters advised that he believed that the findings of the viability assessment were robust, but invited Charles Solomon who had reviewed Grainger's viability appraisal on behalf of the District Valuer to address the Committee on this point.
- Mr Solomon advised that there had been an issue of double-counting in the Cluttons report, although this report had been based on a Three Dragons model, which was not in itself felt to be appropriate as a primary review toolkit for developments of this type. The toolkit used in the report undertaken by Grainger themselves was felt to have been more appropriate, and was felt to be robust.
- Mr Solomon advised that on the basis of his review of Grainger's viability assessment a profit of less than 20% was forecast, which was at a level at which most developers would not bring a scheme forward.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

- In response to a question from the Committee regarding the projected number of jobs the new scheme would support, particularly in the current climate, Mr Walters advised that he was not in a position to answer this in detail, as he was not an expert in employment matters.
- Mr Lewis, asked to comment on English Heritage's view that the application would cause substantial damage to the Conservation Area, advised that his opinion differed from that of English Heritage in this respect.
- The Committee asked about the projected increase of £11m in investment in the area, in response to which Mr Walters advised that this was set out in detail in the GL Hearn report, and was on the basis of 13 million people travelling through Seven Sisters station annually.
- Mr Walters advised that, were permission granted, Grainger would seek to start work as soon as possible.
- The Committee asked about the identification of a location for the market temporarily during construction. Mr Walters reported that a study to identify a temporary market location had been undertaken in 2008, and a number of possible locations, several in close proximity to the site, had been considered and the options discussed with market traders at that time. Although this data was now out of date, this work would be revived as soon as consent was obtained.
- In response to a question regarding the uncertainty facing traders on West Green Road, Mr Walters reported that as a responsible landlord, an offer had been made to traders that was in excess of the statutory compensation due, and that measures had also been taken to support those who were behind with their rent. It was Grainger's intention to work with traders.
- With regard to materials, the applicants confirmed that they were committed to using quality materials, and looked forward to working with the Council in respect of the conditions regarding approval of materials.

Steve Smith, URS, briefly addressed the Committee in respect of the EqIA. 69% of stallholders had been spoken to as part of this process, and the document set out the concerns raised. The EqIA set out that there was a risk of a negative impact, even with the mitigation measures in place, but that there could be no certainty around this issue as it was not possible to predict how successful the new market would be. The EqIA acknowledged that there was a provision of social affordable housing elsewhere in the area. Overall, the EqIA set out the risks associated with the development, and it was for the Committee to take these into account in its deliberation.

Charles Solomon, District Valuer, advised that he had reviewed the viability assessment, in line with appropriate guidance from bodies such as the GLA, and confirmed that this assessment was on the basis of general market conditions, and not specific to an individual developer. Mr Solomon confirmed that this was a complex site with a number of different interests, and was particularly challenging in respect of development costs. Values were anticipated to be broadly in line with market levels for the Tottenham Area,

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

and the profit level was likely to be closer to 15% than 20%, with 20% considered the usual threshold for viability for such schemes. The fact that the developer was still willing to develop at this margin was to be encouraged.

The Committee took the opportunity to examine the plans and drawings associated with the proposal in greater detail, and then had a final opportunity to ask questions of officers. The following points were raised:

- It was confirmed that the size of the market stalls in the new development was planned to be the same as in the existing market.
- It was noted that the large grass area in the middle of the development would require watering, and there was the potential to use greywater and rainwater; officers agreed that this issue would be addressed either by amending the wording of the existing condition in respect of sustainability, or by means of an additional condition.
- In response to a question regarding cycle parking, it was confirmed that an indicative landscaping layout had been provided, but that final details would need to be agreed with TfL. It was confirmed that it was the responsibility of TfL to retain the existing cycle parking.
- It was confirmed that a combination of green roofs and brown roofs was proposed.
- It was agreed that the start of the five-year period for which the traders support package should run should be from the date of commencement of the development, and not from the date of consent.
- It was agreed that measures could be put in place to ensure that the 6 units identified for independent traders on West Green Road were retained for occupation by independent traders.
- The Committee noted that among the characteristics of the existing market were the cafes opening out onto the frontage on Tottenham High Road, and it was agreed that the Committee could indicate to the applicant that it was keen to retain this characteristic, with café space opening out onto the road.

Allan Ledden, Legal Officer, explained to the Committee the proposed amendments to the Conditions as set out in the tabled document (appended to the minutes).

The Committee was asked if there were any additional conditions or informatives they wished to suggest before the Committee moved to vote on the recommendations of the report. The following suggestions were agreed:

- That a condition be added in respect of offering those market traders wishing to return to the site after construction a discounted rent for a set period; examples suggested were a 30% discount for a maximum of 18 months or a 50% discount for a maximum of 12 months, although final details would need to be agreed with the applicant.
- That a condition be added requiring a plan for identifying and consulting on an alternative site for the market during construction on site.
- That a condition be added in respect of local labour for construction work on the site.
- That a condition be added that the applicant should consult with the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

- market traders regarding the internal layout of the new market area,
- That an informative be added in respect of the conditions relating to materials, indicating that members of the Planning Sub Committee should have the opportunity to be involved in the process of approving the materials to be used.
 - That an informative be added that existing traders should be given as much advice and support as possible in respect of publicising the temporary market location.
 - That it be confirmed as part of the s106 agreement that the Market Facilitator Package should run for five years from the commencement of development and not from the granting of consent, as stated in the report.
 - That the conditions proposed in respect of materials should specifically include the balcony frontage materials and colour of bricks proposed.
 - That the issue of the use of greywater / rainwater for the maintenance of the grass area at podium level be addressed either by means of amending the wording of the condition in respect of sustainability, or by means of an additional condition.
 - In response to a concern regarding the occupation of the 6 units recommended for independent traders on West Green Road, it was confirmed that clauses would be included in the s106 Agreement to the effect that the applicant will develop and promote a letting strategy in respect of these units which is consistent with the promotion of West Green Road as a district centre focused around independent trading. This was set out in paragraph 48 of the tabled letter from the GLA.
 - That the hours of operation for the market should be as flexible as at present.
 - That a condition be added requiring a robust maintenance management plan, this to include the maintenance of the memory boxes and kiosks.
 - That an informative be added to indicate that it would be desirable to have a café opening out onto the Tottenham High Road frontage.

Taking into account the amended conditions as tabled and the additional conditions, informatives and additions to the s106 Agreement as set out above, the Chair moved the recommendations of the report and on a vote it was:

RESOLVED

- 1) That planning application HGY/2012/0915 be granted subject to:
 - amended conditions as tabled and as set out below, and the additional conditions requested by the Committee as outlined above
 - a legal agreement set out under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
 - the direction of the Mayor of London; and
 - in accordance with the approved plans and documents in the tables below
- 2) That Conservation Area Consent HGY/2012/0921 be granted subject

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

to:

- a condition set out below; and
- in accordance with the approved plans and documents in the tables below

DOCUMENTS
Title
Planning Statement
Heritage Statement
Consultation Statement
Management Strategy Report
Energy Strategy
Daylight and Sunlight Report Jan 2008
Noise and Vibration Exposure Assessment Jan 2008
Structural Engineering Report Jan 2008
Contamination Survey October 2007
Economic Impact Assessment
Archaeological Desk Bound Assessment
Construction Management Report
Transport Assessment
Equality Impact Assessment

Plan Number	Plan Title
10153/F/01-01	Survey Drawings
8444/T/01A-06	
8444/T 02A-06	
8444/T 03A-06	
8444/T 04A-06	
8444/T 05A-06	
8444/T 06A-06	
P(00)21B	Site Plan
P(00)00A	Basement Floor
P(00) 01E	Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 02C	Upper Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 03C	First Floor Plan
P(00) 04C	Second Floor Plan
P(00) 05B	Third Floor Plan
P(00) 06B	Fourth Floor Plan
P(00) 07C	Fifth & Gallery level Floor Plan
P(00) 08C	Sixth Floor Plan
P(00)10B	Roof Plan
P(00)100D	Tottenham. High Road and Seven Sisters Road
P(00)101C	Suffield and West Green Road + Int. Corner
P(00)102D	West Green, Suffield + 7 Seven Sisters Detail Elevations
P(00)110C	Elevational Site Sections AA BB and CC
P(00)111D	Elevational Site Section DD and EE
P(00)112A	Kiosk Plans and Elevations

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

Implementation

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following plans as submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:-

10153/F/01-01; 8444/T/01A-06, 02A-06, 03A-06, 04A-06, 05A-06 and 06A-06; P(00)21B; P(00)00A, 01E, 02C, 03C, 04C, 05B, 06B, 07C, 08C, 10B, 100D, 101C, 102D, 110C, 111D and 112A

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

Materials

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no part of the development shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with that part have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby authorised shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area

4. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any of the relevant part of the development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references. The development hereby authorised shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.

Hours of Construction

5. The construction works of the development hereby authorised shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

Waste storage and recycling

6. A detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby authorised. The scheme as approved shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development hereby authorised and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

Disabled Access

7. The entrance door to each of the retail units hereby authorised shall have a minimum width of 900mm, and a maximum threshold of 25mm.

Reason: In order to ensure that the shop unit is accessible to all those people who can be expected to use it in accordance with Policy RIM 2.1 'Access For All' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.

Shopfront Design

8. Detailed plans of the design and external appearance of the shopfronts hereby authorised, including details of the fascias, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any shopfront is installed. All shopfronts shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity of the area.

Secured by Design

9. The development hereby authorised shall comply with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1, 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and comply with the aims and objectives of the Police requirement of 'Secured By Design' and 'Designing Out Crime' principles.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development achieves the required crime prevention elements as detailed by Circular 5/94 'Planning Out Crime'.

Parking and Loading/unloading

10. No part of the development hereby authorised shall be occupied unless car parking and loading and unloading facilities to serve that part have been provided in accordance with details previously submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. . The approved facilities shall be permanently retained for the accommodation of vehicles of the occupiers, users , or persons calling

at the premises and shall not be used for any other purposes.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic or the conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway.

11. Details of on site parking management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the use of the basement car parking area. The agreed plan shall be implemented prior to use of the basement car parking area and permanently maintained in operation.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the free flow of traffic or the conditions of general safety along the neighbouring highway.

Satellite Aerials

12. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 4 (1) and Part 25 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, no satellite antenna shall be erected or installed on any building hereby approved. The proposed development shall have a central dish / aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for the residential units created: details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby authorised, and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to prevent the proliferation of satellite dishes on the development.

Drainage

13. The development hereby authorised shall not be commenced until details of drainage works (including a programme for implementation) have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory provision for drainage on site and ensure suitable drainage provision for the authorised development.

Landscaping

14. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a landscaping scheme to include detailed drawings of:

- a. those existing trees to be retained;
- b. those existing trees to be removed;

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of the development hereby authorised; and**
- d. those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species,**

shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Environmental Management Plan/Air Quality Assessment

15. Details of a site specific environmental management plan as referred to in the Air Quality Assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby authorised. The agreed plan shall be implemented during the period of construction.

Reason: In order to ensure that the effects of the construction upon air quality is minimised.

Noise

16. Details of the specification of the glazing to be used in the development hereby authorised with the objective of reducing noise levels within the residential units shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby authorised. The residential units shall not be constructed (and maintained) otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of occupiers of the residential units

17. The service road ventilation plant noise emissions shall be in accordance with the limiting sound pressure level referred to in the Noise and Vibration Exposure Assessment dated May 2012 as

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

prepared by Alan Saunders Associates

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of the occupiers of the proposed development.

Cycle Parking

18. The development hereby authorised shall provide service covered storage for 234 cycle racks for the residential units and 11 cycle racks for the commercial units, a total of 245 cycle racks to be provided. These racks shall be provided prior to occupation of the relevant part of the development hereby authorised and shall be subsequently maintained.

Reason: In order to promote a sustainable mode of travel and improve conditions for cyclists at this location.

Commercial Opening Hours

19. The commercial uses hereby authorised shall not be open to the public before 0700 or after 0100 hours on any day.

Reason: In order to protect the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.

Servicing and Deliveries

20. A servicing and delivery plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, for the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development hereby authorised. The plans should provide details on how servicing and deliveries will take place including access via the proposed service gate and the need to avoid the AM and PM peak periods wherever possible. All servicing and delivery to the development hereby authorised shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To reduce traffic and congestion on the transportation and highways network.

21. A construction management plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of construction work on site. The plan should provide details on how construction work (including demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that minimizes disruption to traffic and pedestrians on A503 Seven Sisters Road and Suffield Road and avoids the AM and PM peak periods wherever possible. All works of construction relating to the development hereby authorised shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation

Climate Change Mitigation

22. The residential development hereby authorised shall comply with Part L of 2010 Building Regulations.

Reason: To be consistent with London Plan Policies 5.2 and 5.3 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

Energy Modelling

23. Energy models for the commercial units hereby authorised based on NCM compliant methods shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works in relation to those units. The commercial units hereby authorised shall not be constructed otherwise than in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To be consistent with London Plan Policies 4A.1 and 4A.7 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

Demolition Management Plan

24. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a demolition management plan detailing the method of demolition, all construction vehicle activity related to demolition works, noise, dust and vibration mitigation measures and suitable measures to enhance the external appearance of the site, including appropriate additional lighting, associated with the development hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Works of demolition associated with the development hereby authorised shall not be undertaken otherwise than in accordance with the approved management plan.

Reason: To protect the existing amenity of the surrounding area.

Photovoltaics

25. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, details and drawings of the proposed photovoltaic equipment shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the development hereby authorised . Such approved scheme shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development hereby authorised and shall be permanently retained.

Reason: In order to ensure the development meets the appropriate design and sustainability standards as required by London Plan Policies 5.2 and 5.3 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

Green Roof

26. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, details and drawings of the proposed green roof shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

commencement of the development hereby authorised. Such approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the occupation of the development hereby authorised and shall be permanently retained.

Reason: In order to ensure the satisfactory provision of the green roof in the interests of sustainability

Piling Method Statement

27. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

Water Infrastructure

28. Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby authorised. The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point. The development hereby authorised shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved studies.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the/this additional demand.

Electric Vehicle Charging Point

29. 1 in 5 parking spaces hereby authorised shall provide an electrical vehicle charging point.

Reason: To encourage the uptake of electric vehicles in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13.

Land Contamination

30. Before development commences other than for investigative work:

a) A desktop study shall be carried out which shall include the identification of previous uses, potential contaminants that might be expected, given those uses, and other relevant information. Using this information, a diagrammatical representation (Conceptual Model) for the site of all potential contaminant sources, pathways and receptors shall be produced. The desktop study and Conceptual Model shall be

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate no risk of harm, development shall not commence until approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

b) If the desktop study and Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a site investigation shall be designed for the site using information obtained from the desktop study and Conceptual Model. This shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that investigation being carried out on site. The investigation must be comprehensive enough to enable:-

- a risk assessment to be undertaken,
- refinement of the Conceptual Model, and
- the development of a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements.

The risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model shall be submitted, along with the site investigation report, to the Local Planning Authority.

c) If the risk assessment and refined Conceptual Model indicate any risk of harm, a Method Statement detailing the remediation requirements, using the information obtained from the site investigation, and also detailing any post remedial monitoring shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to that remediation being carried out on site.

Reason: To ensure the development can be implemented and occupied with adequate regard for environmental and public safety.

CAR-FREE

31. No residents within the proposed developments, with the exception of up to 12 of the proposed houses on Suffield Road will be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) controlling on-street parking in the vicinity of the development." The applicant must contribute a sum of £1000 (One Thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.

Reason: To mitigate the parking demand generated by the development on the local Highways Network and to reduce car ownership and trips generated by car, and increase travel by sustainable modes of transport.

INFORMATIVES

A The development hereby authorised is subject to covenants contained within a planning obligation entered into pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

B The new development will require naming/numbering. The applicant should contact the Transportation Group at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

C There are public sewers crossing or close to the development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

D There are large water mains adjacent to the proposed development. Thames Water will not allow any building within 5 metres of them and will require 24 hours access for maintenance purposes. Please contact Thames Water Developer Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: 0845 850 2777 for further information.

E With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.

F In accordance with Section 34 of the Environmental Protection Act and the Duty of Care, any waste generated from construction/excavation on site is to be stored in a safe and secure manner in order to prevent its escape or its handling by unauthorised persons. Waste must be removed by a registered carrier and disposed of at an appropriate waste management licensed facility following the waste transfer or consignment note system, whichever is appropriate.

G A contribution towards the interchange between rail and underground in order to widen corridors/walkways to the London Underground station may be required. TfL welcomes further discussion about this matter.

H The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT Condition:

1. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

provides.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

- a) It is considered that the principle of this development is supported by National, Regional and Local Planning policies which seek to promote regeneration through housing, employment and urban improvement to support local economic growth.
- b) The scheme is considered to be of a high-quality design which enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area by having a bulk, massing and design which is commensurate to the location and is sympathetic to the architectural language of the Tottenham High Road Corridor/Seven Sisters /Page Green / Conservation Area. The scheme reinforces local distinctiveness and addresses connectivity between people and places and the integration of new development into the built historic environment. It is considered that the development proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and any harm is outweighed by the public benefits brought about by regeneration of the site. The scheme is considered to comply with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- c) The Planning Application has been assessed against and on balance is considered to comply with the
- National Planning Policy Framework;
 - London Plan Policies: 2.15 'Town centres', 3.3 'Increasing housing supply', 3.4 'Optimising housing potential', 3.5 'Quality and design of housing developments', 3.6 'Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities', 3.8 'Housing choice', 3.9 'Mixed and balanced communities', 3.12 'Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes', 4.7 'Retail and town centre development', 4.8 'Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector', 4.9 'Small shops', 4.12 'Improving opportunities for all', 5.2 'Minimising carbon dioxide emissions', 5.3 'Sustainable design and Construction, 5.7 'Renewable energy', 5.10 'Urban greening', 5.11 'Green roofs and development site environs', 5.14 'Water quality and wastewater infrastructure', 5.15 'Water use and supplies', 5.21 'Contaminated land', 6.3 'Assessing effects of development on transport capacity', 6.5 'Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure', 6.9 'Cycling', 6.10 'Walking', 6.12 'Road network capacity', 6.13 'Parking', 6.14 'Freight', 7.1 'Building London's neighbourhoods and communities', 7.2 'An inclusive environment', 7.3 'Designing out crime, 7.4 'Local character', 7.5 'Public realm', 7.6 'Architecture', Policy 7.8 'Heritage assets and Archaeology', 7.9 'Heritage-led regeneration', 7.15 'Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes'; and
 - London Borough of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006 policies G2 'Development and Urban Design', G3'Housing Supply',

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2012**

UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD6 'Mixed Use Developments', UD9 'Locations for Tall Buildings', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG7 'Housing for Special Needs', AC3 'Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor', M2 'Public Transport Network', M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility', M5 'Protection, Improvements and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes', M9 'Car- Free Residential Developments', M10 'Parking for Development', CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas', CSV2 'Listed Buildings', CSV3 Locally Listed Buildings and Designated Sites of Industrial Heritage Interest', CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas', EMP3 'Defined Employment Areas - Employment Locations', EMP5 'Promoting Employment Uses', ENV1 'Flood Protection: Protection of the Floodplain and Urban Washlands', ENV2 'Surface Water Runoff', ENV4 'Enhancing and Protecting the Water Environment' ENV5 'Works Affecting Watercourses', ENV6 'Noise Pollution', ENV7 'Water and Light Pollution', ENV11 'Contaminated Land' and ENV13 'Sustainable Waste Management'

COUNCILLOR ALI DEMIRCI
Chair