

8. LAND AT HARINGEY HEARTLANDS (PAGES 1 - 60)

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 12 February 2018

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM 8

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Reference No: HGY/2017/3117	Ward: Noel Park
<p>Address: Land at Haringey Heartlands, between Hornsey Park Road, Mayes Road, Coburg Road, Western Road and the Kings Cross / East Coast Mainline, Clarendon Gas Works, Olympia Trading Estate, and 57-89 Western Road, London N8 & N22</p> <p>Proposal: Hybrid planning permission (part Outline, part Detailed) for the demolition of Olympia Trading Estate and Western Road buildings and structures and a phased residential led mixed use development comprising the construction of buildings across the site to include the following 163,300sqm GEA Use Class C3 Residential; 7,500sqm GEA Class B1 Business; 1,500sqm to 3,950sqm GEA Class A1-A4; 417sqm GEA Class D1 Day Nursery; and up to 2,500sqm GEA Class D1/D2 Leisure; New Basement Level; Two Energy Centres; Vehicular Access, Parking; Realignment of Mary Neuner Road; Open space; Associated Infrastructure and Interim Works; Site Preparation Works.</p> <p>Outline Permission is sought for 103,150sqm Class C3 Residential; 7,168sqm to 7,500sqm Class B1 Business Use; 1,500sqm to 3,950sqm Class A1-A4; and up to 2,500sqm Class D1/D2 Leisure Use; Buildings up to 103.90m AOD; associated cycle and car parking provision; new basement level; two energy centres; new public square, public realm works and landscaping; vehicular access and new servicing arrangements; associated highway works; and facilitating works. Appearance, Landscaping, Layout, Scale and Access are Reserved Matters. Vehicular access into the Basement Car Park from Mary Neuner Road and Western Road are submitted in detail.</p> <p>Detailed Permission is sought for the construction of Building A1-A4, B1-B4 and C1; ranging from 2 to 15 storeys to accommodate 616 residential units; 332sqm Class B1 Business Use/Class A1-A4 Use; 417sqm Day Nursery; associated cycle and car parking provision; two basements; public realm works and landscaping; vehicular access and new servicing arrangements; associated highway works; Realignment of Mary Neuner Road.</p> <p>Applicant: St William Homes LLP</p> <p>Ownership: Private</p>	

The following matters are points of clarification or correction and also respond to representations received following publication of the committee report.

Affordable housing

The application proposes 45.6% of the uplift in habitable rooms above the original 24.4% (from the extant permission) as affordable housing, not 35% (6.6.4). The uplift is from 205 affordable (extant permission) to 444 affordable homes, more than double.

The time limited marketing of the scheme for a period of two months relates to the shared ownership homes (*page 141, s.106 Head of Terms (1)(III) bullet point 2*).

The “Pre-Implementation Review” for the detailed component is after 18 months rather than 2 years.

The 32.5% by habitable room affordable proposal is greater than the maximum reasonable viable amount (*page 137, section 1.2 bullet point 6*) of 8% affordable (24.5% betterment) when benchmarked against the extant permission.

CIL

CIL payment estimated at £32.5M (£25.5M LBH CIL and £7.0M mayoral CIL with affordable housing relief). The extant permission was approved before CIL was introduced. (*page 146*) and contributed £8M s.106 by comparison.

Heads of Terms

In recent discussions between the applicant, LBH and Transport for London regarding transport contributions the applicant has agreed to provide a bus driver facility in one of the following blocks (H2, H3 or D4). The following head is added:

- Provisions for a public transport driver facility in blocks H2, H3 or D4.
- Workplace Travel Plan, b: change “residential induction packs” to “employee induction packs”
- Workplace Travel Plan, d: is corrected, as above, to refer to vehicles for all users.

The bus contribution has been amended to £900,000 and the walking and cycling contribution has been decreased to £255,000. This is to reflect the long build out of the site and the need to subsidise the bus service for 5 years.

Loss of Business

The application site (4.8ha) includes land owned by Haringey Council (0.28ha). Businesses on this land will be relocated by Haringey Council prior to this last phase of development as part of the s.106 legal agreement (*page 146, s.106 Head of Terms*).

Impact on adjacent sites

An additional bullet point to condition 4 is proposed to be included on the decision notice to address the concerns of La Salle in relation to the Bittern Place site:

“Reserved matters applications for any development within development zones H, D and E must be accompanied by a report and/or masterplan demonstrating that the proposed development does not compromise the deliverability of development of adjoining sites”

Heritage

As the Council will have taken Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 into account, it would be prudent to confirm this in the report as follows.

Legal Position and policy relating to Heritage Assets

The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case indicates that "Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise." The Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks District Council case indicates that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit.

When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted.

The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrefutable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit to each element needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given 'considerable importance and weight' in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.

Policy 7.8 of the London Plan requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Policy DM9 of the Councils Development Management DPD pre-submission version 2016 continues this approach.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory obligation on Local Planning Authorities, as decision maker, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building and its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and that any harm to their significance requires a clear and convincing justification (paragraph 132). Paragraph 132 of the NPPF clarifies the more important the asset, the greater the weight given to the assets conservation should be. It also makes clear that significance can be harmed through development within the setting of a heritage asset. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a proposed development would lead to harm to the significance of a designated heritage, this harm should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal.

To confirm the proposal causes less than substantial harm to heritage assets and this harm is outweighed by positive townscape benefits.

PTAL

The site benefits from a PTAL of 4-6 with existing public transport accessibly and improvements to the Piccadilly Line (3.3.6 and 6.2.5).

Plan numbers – the following plans are superseded by revisions.

~~439/P/SQ/203~~ 439/P/SQ/203 (Rev A);

~~439/P/SQ/204~~ 439/P/SQ/204 (Rev A);

~~439/P/SQ/207~~ 439/P/SQ/207 (Rev A);

~~439/C1/100~~ 439/P/C1/100 (Rev A);

Corrections

Class A5 uses have been removed from the proposed development.

The site benefits from a PTAL of 4-6 with existing public transport accessibly and improvements to the Piccadilly Line (3.3.6 and 6.2.5).

3.3.1 – National Grid, St William and Haringey Council part own the site, not the Greater London Authority.

Paragraph 3.1.3 Third sentence is corrected to say A1-A4 not A1-A5 as no A5 is now proposed as part of revisions to the application.

Paragraph – 3rd sentence should say 1719 homes not 1291.

6.2.25 – the height of the development rises to 15 floors at Block C7. In the northern quarter on the south side of the square, buildings up to 19 storeys are proposed along the northern edge, with flexibility, if a 4 storey office building is proposed, that height could increase to 23 storeys.

6.2.7 (page 175) – Policy DM6 Building Heights allocates the site as suitable for tall buildings. This is now an adopted policy not emerging.

6.4.2 – Local Plan allocation SA22 Clarendon Square is excluded from the Local Employment Area allocation. SA24 North West of Clarendon Square isn't excluded.

6.4.2 (page 182) – the proposed 630 jobs from Class B1 uses, are in addition to an estimated 215 jobs from Class A uses and 45 jobs from Class D uses totalling 890 jobs.

6.5.5 – there is no requirement to assess daylight and sunlight impact on commercial uses under BRE Guidance. However, the northern quarter is submitted in outline only and can therefore respond at reserved matters stage. New adjacent proposals can also respond to this scheme.

6.5.12 – the National Grid consent has been implemented and therefore could be completed.

6.5.2 – there will be 171 wheelchair units with the proposal.

6.5.6 – with 1714 homes, the required amenity space will be 9733m², marginally greater than 9,647m² but still well below the 34,293m² proposed.

6.10.17: the applicant is not proposing to provide off-street parking for the non-residential land uses, although some on-street, short stay car parking will be provided on Mary Neuner Road as part of the proposed realignment scheme. It is to be noted that the London Plan requires the commercial element of the development to be provided with at least one accessible car parking bay designated for Blue Badge Holders, even if general parking is not provided.

Paragraph 6.4.2 – the second sentence is corrected to refer to SA24 (not SA22) which is within a Local Employment Area (Wood Green Regeneration Area).

6.4.7 A5 is removed from the sentence. No A5 is included in the proposal.

6.10.11- the table under this paragraph relates to underground trips only and is therefore removed from this section.

Clarifications

Paragraph 6.2.5 – the PTAL rating is 4-6 without the Piccadilly Line improvements and is not therefore reliant on it.

Paragraph 6.4.4 – add 'office' after employment to clarify nature of space.

Planning Conditions

A number of corrections and amendments are proposed to the following planning conditions, to reflect the most recent changes to the scheme and, where required, remove duplication as follows:

- B2 – the words ‘for each phase of development’ and ‘each phase’ is added to reflect the multi-phase nature of the development.
- B3 – Timings (Outline) - the timings are amended to reflect the indicative phasing shown in the Environmental Statement and also the timings for pre-implementation review mechanisms.
- B4 - Reserved matters specification. Reference to a single application is deleted as a strategy for submission of reserved matters is already included in B4. Requirement 5 under landscaping is deleted as this duplicates the soft landscaping and play space condition. A requirement is added to submit an updated commercial strategy.
- New condition 11 – Noise (Internal Standards) is added to secure recommendations within the Environmental Statement.
- 28 Air Quality – the condition wording is amended to clarify that the requirement for an update to the Air Quality Assessment relates to the outline element of the scheme to confirm the findings of the submitted Environmental Statement.

For completeness, the full wording is shown below.

B2 (Amended) Reserved Matter Approval (Scale, Appearance, Layout, Access, Landscaping)

This permission is granted in OUTLINE, in accordance with the provisions of Article 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 and before any development is commenced, except for Site Preparation Works, the approval of the Local Planning Authority shall be obtained to the following reserved matters:

- (a) appearance;
- (b) landscaping;
- (c) layout; and
- (d) scale
- (e) access

Full particulars of these reserved matters, including plans, sections and elevations and all to an appropriate scale, and any other supporting documents shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for the purpose of obtaining their approval, in writing, for each phase of development. The development of each phase shall then be carried out in complete accordance with those particulars.

For the avoidance of doubt, the illustrative drawings submitted in support of the application including those set out within the approved Design and Access Statements are not approved.

Reason: In order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) which requires the submission to and approval by, the Local Planning Authority of reserved matters.

B3 (Amended) COMPLIANCE - Time limits for Reserved Matters (Outline)

The first application for the approval of Reserved Matters within the OUTLINE permission hereby approved, as depicted on the approved plans shall be made to the Local Planning Authority no later than the expiration of five years from the date of this permission with all applications for the approval of the remaining Reserved Matters made no later than the expiration of ten years from the date of this permission, and the development hereby authorised must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates, failing which the permission shall be of no effect:

- a) The expiration of five years from the date of this permission OR
- b) The expiration of three years from the final date of approval of any of the reserved matters.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 92 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

B4 (Amended) COMPLIANCE - Reserved Matters Specification (List of documentation to accompany Reserved Matters Applications)

Each application for the approval of Reserved Matters submitted pursuant to condition 2 shall contain such information set out below as is relevant to the application and shall be consistent with the information approved for the relevant phase pursuant to Condition 29 (Phasing Strategy).

- A statement (including accompanying design material) to demonstrate compliance with the parameter plans, Development Specification and mandatory requirements in the approved Design Code (January 2018) unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority. The statement will also clearly set out how the application fits with a wider strategy for the submission for all reserved matters in securing a coordinated and coherent approach to phased development.
- A report demonstrating how the measures identified in the approved Culture Strategy (October 2017) have been incorporated into the detailed design, including how the cultural and industrial history of the area has been interpreted in the proposals;
- A report must be submitted that outlines that the environmental information already submitted to the LPA is adequate to assess the environmental effects of the application and inform decision making; or,
- Provides further information, in accordance with regulation 22(1) of the 2011 EIA Regs, to assess the environmental effects of the application and inform decision making.

- An updated commercial strategy detailing how the minimum commercial floorspace requirements are being provided.

Access

- 1) Detailed plans and drawings including drawings to show method of construction, traffic calming measures, drainage, street lighting, kerb alignment, levels, areas of highway visibility and surface treatment.
- 2) A report and plans detailing layout including parking areas, servicing areas and plant areas; and
- 3) A report and plans detailing any necessary temporary layout and landscaping associated with boundary treatment and condition;

Landscaping

- 1) Details of any play equipment proposed for the child play spaces;
- 2) How a coordinated approach to elements such as electricity, water, storage, street furniture will be achieved to avoid cluttering
- 3) If a public market is proposed within the main public square, how it will provide services and ancillary space for storage
- 4) Any landscaping mitigation measures required to mitigate potential wind tunnel effects

Appearance

- 1) Details of rooftop and roofscape in accordance with Design Code (January 2018);
- 2) Details of the wind mitigation measures, including any screening or other measures around balconies or communal amenity areas and how the design of blocks responds to micro-climate issues.

Reason: To ensure the development is consistent with London Plan Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6, Local Plan Policy SP11, and emerging Policy DM1. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the pre-commencement requirements of the condition are so fundamental to the development permitted that it would have been otherwise necessary to refuse the whole permission.

(New Condition) COMPLIANCE – Development in accordance with Noise and Vibration Report

- a) Prior to the commencement of each phase of the development hereby approved, except for Site Preparation Works, details of the sound attenuation to protect against externally generated (environmental) noise sources including rail transport so as to achieve the internal ambient noise levels detailed in Table 10.14 (Chapter 10, ES October 2017) and BS8233:2014 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The measured or calculated noise levels shall be determined in accordance to the latest British Standard 8233:2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.
- b) The approved works are to be completed prior to occupation of the development and retained for the lifetime of the development.

- c) Prior to first occupation of the development, a Post Completion Report demonstrating compliance with the mitigation measures in A above shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities, health and safety of neighbouring properties and occupiers and of the area generally, and to ensure compliance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan (2016)

29. (Amended) PRE COMMENCEMENT – Updated Air Quality Assessment

Part A:

Prior to the submission of any reserved matters, an updated air quality assessment shall be submitted and approved by the Council in line with best practice guidance and other guidance provided by the Council. The air quality assessment will:

- Identify how the building works and related activities and the future operation and use of the development site may impact upon local air quality.
- Model the impact of the development on local air quality using ADMS Urban, agreed traffic data, include surrounding developments, all site-wide emission sources (CHP, gas boilers, energy centres) and include scenarios of pre-agreed years and worst case,
- Identify mitigation measures that are already part of any planned development and should any risk of exposure to poor air quality be determined, mitigation measures shall be included, where applicable, in the buildings design
- Identify possible additional mitigation measures that may be implemented to maintain and where possible improve air quality in the vicinity of the development.
- Provide full details of measures that will be implemented to maintain and where possible improve air quality in the vicinity of the development.
- Provide full details of measures that will be implemented to protect the internal air quality of buildings.
- Identify measures that will be implemented or continue to be implemented after the completion of the development with clear timescales of when information will be provided.

Part B: All measures identified within the approved air quality assessment that are to be installed during the course of the development will be fully implemented. No occupation will take place until a report demonstrating that each measure is fully implemented has been provided to the satisfaction of and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Part C: All measures identified within the approved air quality assessment that will be implemented or continue to be implemented after the completion of the development will be completed within agreed timescales. A report demonstrating that all such measures set out within the approved air quality assessment have

been installed will be provided to the satisfaction of and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Part D: No development works will take place for the outline element, until a detailed site-wide Air Quality Assessment in line with guidance from the GLA has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect air quality and people's health by ensuring that the production of air pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter, are kept to a minimum during the course of building works and during the lifetime of the development. To contribute towards the maintenance or to prevent further exceedances of National Air Quality Objectives.

Local Representations as at 7 February 2018 further comments received prior to committee will be included in a further addendum or reported on the night

A further 11 objections have been received including the Palace View Residents Association. The main comments include:

- The impact on the views from Alexandra Palace
- The height of the blocks and overall density
- Inadequate provision for schools, GP surgeries or any other services for new residents.
- Lack of information regarding 'affordable rents' or social housing
- Scheme should be reconsidered and less housing built
- The Moselle should be de-culverted
- The application does not comply with London Plan and LBH Energy policies
- Carbon off-setting should be paid
- Lack of car parking spaces which will have a knock-on effect locally

A further 4 letters of support have been received. The main comments include:

- Local businesses, start-ups and creative enterprises will be supported
- Amendments to the scheme have addressed previous concerns regarding impacts on neighbouring businesses
- The scheme will provide community and open spaces
- Meanwhile uses will be encouraged during build out

Further observations from Catherine West MP have been received.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
Palace View Residents Association		
	The impact on the views from Alexandra Palace, where currently buildings are low rise. It was felt that the height of the blocks will seriously damage the view from the park especially from the old racecourse and Newlands Fields area, making the Park feel enclosed and much less of an open space much loved and	The full assessment of harm against mitigation and benefits is addressed in the main body of the report.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>appreciated by all who use the Park. Also the view from the Palace will be seriously damaged.' Blots on the landscape', 'who wants to live in high rises anymore?', 'people want gardens' were some of the comments made.</p> <p>The sheer density of the development is daunting and there appear to be no plans for schools, GP surgeries or any other services for new residents. There is a paucity of car parking spaces which will have a knock-on effect locally, even on our side of the Park. There seem to be no related plans for improving local transport which is already overcrowded. We can find no mention of 'affordable rents' or social housing both of which are in very short supply especially as homes are going to be demolished to make way for this development.</p> <p>Overall, these plans are viewed with a mixture of horror and suspicion. It is felt that this will damage the quality of the environment and should be seriously reconsidered and far less housing built on what is a relatively small plot of land.</p>	
<p>Electoral Reform Services</p>	<p>Please note the Electoral Reform Services Ltd (ERS) would like to conditionally withdraw their objection made on 21st December to the above planning application.</p> <p>Subject to the changes set out below being agreed or secured within any planning consent, ERS conditionally</p>	<p>Conditional support noted. The plans referred to would be secured via any planning permission.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>remove its objection and now offer its support for the revised planning application.</p> <p>ERS has had several productive meetings with the applicant, St William, who have agreed to amend the application and/or to undertake mitigation measures which would allow ERS to withdraw their objection.</p> <p>These are namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To install blinds and/or a privacy film over the office floor windows of the ERS building that face onto the St William application site. 2. To remove bedrooms on all floors directly facing the ERS building and to insert living/kitchen dining or bathrooms in the flank wall facing the ERS building. This requires the replacement of Plan SK/A1/001 Rev G with SK/A1/001 Rev A option B or any such similar plan (see both plans attached) and for similar plans for all floors of the building. (Note all attached plans are illustrative and we understand that revised plans have now been submitted). 3. A full height translucent glass screen (or other acoustic barrier to be agreed) on the ground, first and second floors balcony/terrace immediately facing the ERS building as shown (or similar to) on the attached plan and illustration (439 CGW Block A1 Privacy Screen). Again we understand that revised plans have been submitted. 4. Use of the existing temporary car park on part of the site of block A1 or B1 for ERS use until July 	<p>These changes are now reflected in the revised plans. Officers agree that the changes address the issues raised and provide sufficient safeguards for the continued operation of the business.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="685 237 1361 347">2019 or the provision a suitably fenced and gated, temporary surfaced alternative of similar parking capacity.</p> <p data-bbox="589 387 1397 719">Resolution of Planning Issues The proposal to install film and/or blinds on the ERS building overcomes ERS objections concerning overlooking and security. The movement of bedrooms away from the ERS face of the building and the insertion of acoustic barriers on the balcony sides facing ERS will mitigate our concerns over noise and disturbance. The use of a temporary car park for the specified period will allow ERS to manage their vehicular access issues.</p> <p data-bbox="589 762 1397 1058">Conditional Withdrawal ERS conditionally withdraws its objections to planning application HGY/2017/3117 if the matters set out above are either resolved between ERS and St William through the passage of the application or when layout and other plans that achieve points 2 and 3 are agreed by the Council. ERS thus removes its objection and offers support for the revised planning application.</p>	
102 North View Road	<p data-bbox="589 1062 1397 1173">The proposed buildings are far too high overlooking and overshadowing the two-storey houses in Hornsey Park Road.</p> <p data-bbox="589 1216 1361 1361">There will be noise and disruption from the building work. The loss of jobs from the closing of Iceland and the business park and the loss of the valued Iceland store for local people.</p>	<p data-bbox="1424 1062 2011 1394">The nature of the site along with the design of the proposal minimises the potential for concern from loss of privacy due to overlooking into windows to neighbouring residential habitable rooms or private amenity spaces. The Design and Access Statement shows how the massing has been reduced along sensitive eastern boundary. This</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>No new transport links or public facilities or open space are planned for the thousands more people who will be living here under the scheme. Please rethink this flawed plan!</p>	<p>includes orientating the development to minimise overlooking and loss of privacy. The overall economic impact, including improvement in quality of employment floorspace is judged to be a significant benefit to the scheme. A range of community and public spaces are proposed as part of the scheme and the site benefits from existing high public transport accessibility.</p>
<p>15 Jansons Road</p>	<p>Any consent for this proposal should be conditional on the de-culverting of the River Moselle across the site.</p> <p>To grant consent for this planning application without daylighting the relevant stretch of the Moselle watercourse would be a huge loss of potential amenity to the borough, go against enlightened planning policy with regard to watercourse management, and miss a once in a lifetime opportunity for a visionary approach to regeneration of the site.</p> <p>Local authorities across the country are recognising the value of de-culverting buried water courses in order to aid flood prevention, create vital green spaces for public enjoyment, promote biodiversity, and enhance people's connection with space. Living rivers add a vital additional dimension that strengthens and enhances people's connection with nature.</p> <p>The East of Haringey is an area deficient in green space -- the de-culverting and daylighting of the Moselle</p>	<p>Officers accept that it is impractical to open the culvert at this point in time although provisions are in place through the legal agreement to reassess this regularly against agreed water standards. The GLA and Environment Agency have also accepted this position.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>would help to address this, as has happened with the stretch of the Moselle in Lordship Rec. The de-culverting there has helped transform the park, making it an attractive area to be enjoyed by all - a huge environmental improvement in an area of social deprivation. While contaminated water from misconnected drains meant that the Moselle has been quite unpleasant in the past, actions by Haringey Council to remedy this problem have been very successful and the brook is now significantly cleaner.</p> <p>The developers want to keep the river buried, and are proposing a pathway marking the course of the river, claiming that de-culverting and daylighting are not feasible because the culvert is too deep. But this is untrue -- in some places the culvert is just below the surface, and the site could be contoured in those places where it is not. Additionally, Thames Water advises that the water quality is acceptable, and the Environment agency has stated that it believes there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated "main river" to a more natural state. It notes that naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28 -- the developers</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>should comply with this. De-culverting would mean that the development complies with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17. Haringey Council should therefore insist that this de-culverting is continued across the Haringey Heartlands site, which would help put the council at the forefront of more enlightened approaches to river management being implemented across the UK, and advise the developer that permission will be refused unless the plans are revised accordingly.</p>	
<p>115 Seaford Road</p>	<p>I think this would make a significant improvement to the environment but also the health of human society as well.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>136 Hewitt Avenue</p>	<p>Contrary to developer's claims, this proposal IS feasible, as water quality is already acceptable, and can be improved before construction is completed. Contouring of the site can accommodate varying culvert depths.</p> <p>It's now or never. Failing to open up the river will be a tremendous missed opportunity.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated: We believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated main river to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area.</p>	<p>Please see answer above.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28 ; the developers should comply with this.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA;s London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17</p>	
<p>Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth</p>	<p>This is additional material from Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth, supplementing our earlier comments.</p> <p>1) There is no statement or measureable assessment of sustainability for the new homes in the development. This is needed to deliver the policy requirement in the NPPF, London Plan and local plan. It should be set out and enforced to be delivered on site through the construction process. Why are the Council letting St William of this requirement?</p> <p>2) The overheating assessment shows that the homes in the detailed part of the application will be at risk of overheating. This risk is going to increase as climate change increases the urban heat island. What is the Council going to do to reduce and remove this risk?</p>	<p>A Sustainability Statement has been provided in support of the application. This addresses current planning policy requirements.</p> <p>The overheating assessment is discussed in the main body of the report. A planning condition is recommended to provide further details, and where necessary, mitigation.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>3) We believe that two energy centres on the site are not policy compliant (London Plan 5.6). There should be only one serving the whole site. This would be more efficient reducing carbon and air pollution emissions, and show mitigation measures have been implemented of the impacts in the Environmental Impact Assessments. Will the smaller energy centre be forced to shut down earlier to reduce the impacts of this? Can the number of energy centres be reviewed and reduced now rather than in the future?</p> <p>4) There are no renewable technologies on this scheme. This goes against policy at a regional and local level. This is shocking given that the Council has recently signed up to being a Zero Carbon Borough by 2050. Can this be enforced on the scheme, or would the developer be willing to pay for the required renewables on this site, to be delivered on schools across the borough? And can the Carbon Offsetting for this development be ring-fenced for community renewables rather than being kept by the developer?</p> <p>5) The Carbon Offsetting on this scheme seems to be retained by the developer (St William) and it is not clear as to why this is being used to fund the developer's policy requirements. The Energy Strategy sets out the Carbon Offsetting will be used to fund a larger energy centre. As this is Section 106, if extra money is needed to deliver the enlarged energy centre, this should be funded through Community Infrastructure Levy. Using the expected Section 106 Carbon Offsetting</p>	<p>There is no policy requirement to provide one single energy centre; proposals should be assessed against the energy hierarchy. This is a long-term development spanning 10+ years. The proposed energy centres and wider district centre energy network has not been designed and therefore the exact requirements for the energy centres within the outline element cannot be known at this point in time. The legal agreement includes a requirement for the applicant to decommission temporary energy centres upon any connection to the District Energy Network (to be built by LBH).</p> <p>The application has been assessed against the energy hierarchy. Taking into account the wider benefits of the scheme, specifically provision for the DEN, the scheme is judged to be acceptable in energy terms.</p> <p>The carbon offsetting is not being retained by the developer. Land and space for the delivery of the DEN by the Council is being provided in lieu of the carbon offset. This must also be balanced with the overall viability of the scheme. The Carbon Offset forms part</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Funds for commercial requirements look like breaking state aid rules. There are also no costs as to the build of this new energy centre. What if the costs of building the new energy centre are more than the expected Carbon Offsetting requirements or less? Why is the developer being allowed to keep this money?</p> <p>The carbon offsetting cost for the development should be - 1,373 (tonnes of carbon to be offset) x £95 (new cost of carbon London Plan 2017) x 30 years = £3, 913, 050 over the full development</p> <p>6) The AQ modelling in the EIA does not include the collective AQ impacts / emissions from adjacent developments. This is a requirement set out in Schedule 4 of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. These cumulative effects should include impacts from the neighbouring developments at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cultural Quarter development site (the Chocolate Factory), - Bittern Place development site; and - Iceland Site development site <p>7) The AQ assessment has modelled stack heights of 3m above the roof height of block A4. Block A4 is the proposed location of the SE energy centre. There is a discrepancy between the Energy assessment and the AQ assessment. The Energy Assessment states that the stack heights are 2m above roof height of the tallest building. Which is correct, as this will impact on the modelling and local air quality in Wood</p>	<p>of the planning policy framework and there is no 'state aid' issue. These policy requirements must be considered in the overall planning balance, together with the scheme's wider economic, social and environmental benefits.</p> <p>These policy requirements must be balanced in the overall context of scheme viability.</p> <p>The EIA has considered the cumulative impacts, including those schemes within 350m. These were scoped during the earlier preparation of the Environmental Statement. The full details of some of the schemes cited are still emerging and were not available at the earlier scoping stage so could not have reasonably be included. Officers are satisfied the full environmental impacts have been assessed. A further planning condition is proposed to require a further assessment of the outline element of the scheme, prior to commencement which will be an opportunity to update the modelling to take into account further information should it be available.</p> <p>The Air Quality assessment used the following "One gas-fired CHP and three</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Green?</p> <p>8) The masterplan plan indicates Energy centres below many of the residential blocks and commercial units. The emissions from these energy centres should modelled and the emissions impacts on these units above the Energy Centres should be assessed and mitigation highlighted.</p>	<p>gas-fired boilers are proposed as part of the Development. The proposed heating plant would release emissions through flues at 3m above roof level of Block A4 of the Development.” The exact flue height is provided in Chapter 5. “The flue will be situated within Building A4 and terminates at a height of 78.2m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).”</p> <p>No heights for the outline can be specified as final building heights not known.</p> <p>The applicant undertook a detailed and extensive scoping process with Haringey and the choice of model was agreed via the EIA Scoping Report, see Table 9.1 of Chapter 9: Air Quality of the Environmental Statement and Appendix 9.3 but will be updated for the purposes of the outline element.</p>
10 Bedford Road	<p>I object to the proposal - unless de-culverting is incorporated. My reasons for this include: The development should comply with the GLA’s London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17.</p>	<p>Officers accept that it is impractical to open the culvert at this point in time although provisions are in place through the legal agreement to reassess this regularly against agreed water standards. The GLA and Environment Agency have also accepted this position.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>This proposal IS feasible, despite the developer's claims otherwise, as water quality is already acceptable.</p>	
<p>88 Umfreville Road</p>	<p>I understand that the planning application does not include de-culverting the hidden Moselle river - a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to increase bio-diversity and green space in the area as well as improve water quality in the river downstream. I gather the developers should have taken this into account in their planning as per notes below and that de-culverting is perfectly feasible.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated: We believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated 'main river' to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28 'the developers should comply with this.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17</p>	<p>As above.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
7 Ellesmere Road	<p>On my visits to Tottenham I can see the value of the Moselle River where it is already de-culverted. I think that the river is an asset to the area, and I object to this Planning Application unless de-culverting of the Moselle River is incorporated in it.</p>	As above.
40 Lausanne Road	<p>I object unless more vision is incorporated including allowing the River Moselle to see daylight again.</p>	As above.
8 Conway Road	<p>I object to the proposal, unless de-culverting the Moselle River underneath it is incorporated. It's now or never. Failing to open up the river will be a tremendous missed opportunity.</p> <p>Contrary to the developer's claims, this proposal IS feasible, as water quality is already acceptable, and can be improved before construction is completed. Contouring of the site can accommodate varying culvert depths.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated: We believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated main river to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28 the developers should</p>	As above.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>comply with this. The current proposal is unimaginative and a hugely wasted opportunity.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17</p> <p>Please do not approve this development until the Moselle is brought back to daylight. We live in a borough with little green space and waterways as it is. Open this up to the public will support the amenity of local residents' health and mental health and local wildlife too.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this comment.</p>	
63 Lymington Avenue	<p>I object to this application unless it includes an enforceable commitment to de-culverting the Moselle Brook.</p> <p>Contrary to developer's claims, de-culverting the Moselle IS feasible, as water quality is already acceptable, and can be improved before construction is completed. Contouring of the site can accommodate varying culvert depths.</p> <p>It's now or never. Failing to open up the Moselle will be an irresponsible missed opportunity.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated: We believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the</p>	As above.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Moselle Brook and restore the designated main river to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28 the developers should comply with this.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17.</p>	
<p>The Gas Works Project, Mandarin Wharf, 70 De Beauvoir Crescent</p>	<p>I am writing to you to outline what I believe are the many and varied benefits of The Gas Works Project meanwhile scheme and the Clarendon Gas Works final development. The two are intrinsically linked.</p> <p>I am the founder and director of The Mill Co. Project (TMCP), a thriving social enterprise business that provides high quality, mixed-use affordable workspace, co-working space and hotel space for artists, designers and creative SMEs in London. My team and I currently have 11 buildings (totalling 250,000 sq ft) and support just under 250 creative businesses.</p> <p>Seven of the buildings sit under the TMCP umbrella. The other four are Special Project Vehicles (SPVs). For the most part these SPVs are partnerships with established</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>developers and are long-term, sustainable projects. We animate meanwhile spaces before taking long-term head leases on the commercial spaces within final developments. The meanwhile sites do two things:</p> <p>They generate significant social, cultural and community capital. They inform how the final commercial spaces should be configured and built out. The meanwhile phases effectively act as ‘development and discovery’ periods.</p> <p>Regardless of the lifespan of a particular project, all of them deliver collaborative environments that enable tenants to prosper and grown. Over the years many of our tenants have evolved from embryonic businesses to become highly regarded and profitable SMEs. We work to create spaces that improve communities. We bring about sympathetic and holistic regeneration.</p> <p>The plan for the Olympia Trading Estate is in line with our other SPVs, in the sense that the meanwhile will transition through to the permanent. It is a long-term project.</p> <p>For phase one we will set up The Gas Works Project, a meanwhile social enterprise scheme that will stand for three years before work starts on the final St William development. We will reanimate three office blocks and adjoining warehouses to create a genuinely affordable, vibrant and bustling workspace and community hub. In</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>part it is about reanimating a drab and uninspired corner of Wood Green.</p> <p>Local businesses, start-ups and nascent artistic and creative enterprises will be brought in and brought along. Dexterous makers and practitioners of different disciplines will prosper and grow. There will be different-sized workspace and maker space studios, a brewery, a performance space run by an immersive theatre company and a bustling street food market and community hop garden. We will do all of this and retain two of the three existing businesses currently based at the site.</p> <p>Key points to note.</p> <p>A new community space The Gas Works Project is not just about commercial workspace. There will be public realm, community areas and amenities too. The access road at the back of the plot will be reimagined and lined with planters and foliage. And open to everyone. At the north end of the road (next to the brewery and tap room – also open to the public), will be a hop garden and outside bar. We are in discussions with an immersive production company to take warehouses two, three and four. When said company is not using these spaces (they tend to put on their productions in the evening), they will be made available to community groups, local schools and arts organisations.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>A new home for Collage Arts Warehouse one at The Gas Works Project will be taken by Collage Arts. They will be transitioning from Chocolate Factory Three on the opposite side of Coburg Road. Collage Arts is being forced to leave its current premises by the landowner. There was wide-scale disquiet that the Collage Arts tenants – circa 100 artists and creatives – would be losing their work studios and have nowhere to go. These businesses will have a new home at The Gas Works Project and jobs will be protected.</p> <p>Protecting a successful local business – Turnaround Publishing Turnaround is an independent publishing house that was founded in Haringey in the late 1980s. It is a local business success story and today employs over 40 full time staff, most in administrative and creative roles. They currently have an office and distribution centre on the site. While their distribution centre will move permanently from the Olympia Trading Estate, their offices will stay – for the meanwhile Gas Works Project phase and hopefully final scheme.</p> <p>Phase two is the final development – Clarendon Gas Works (St William working title). We will work with St William to design and build a significant portion of the workspace and commercial units for the final scheme, with the intention of taking a long-term head lease on these areas. We will implement an altruistic decant transition strategy wherein those businesses that thrive</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>at The Gas Works Project effectively stay on-site. They will take space at Clarendon Gas Works and continue to develop and grow. They will be ingrained in the masterplan and entrenched in the local community.</p>	
<p>The Goodness Brewing Company</p>	<p>I am the founder of The Goodness Brewery & Tap. We are at an advanced stage of discussions with Nick Hartwright at Mill Co. to take one half of the fifth warehouse unit at The Gas Works. To say that we are excited about this opportunity is a huge understatement. It is a real game-changer for us and we cannot wait to fit out the brewery and tap room, set up the outside hop garden and start operations.</p> <p>My business partner Zack and I are both from the area with children in local schools – we are certainly not Haringey hipsters and we are not coming to The Gas Works to make a quick profit and then leave. For the last two years we have been running a community hopping project called Wood Green Hopping, the purpose of which is to get local people growing hops together. We have brewed a harvest time ‘green hopped’ beer and we’ve also helped dozens of people learn how to make it for themselves and got our members involved in the whole process of brewing wherever we could. We are incredibly passionate about what we do – we’ve seen people come together through hopping. They get their hands dirty, they have fun, and they have conversations about how we can all work together to better the local community. We feel The Goodness Brewery & Tap will</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>be an extension of this and allow us to have an even wider programme of community engagement.</p> <p>At The Gas Works we will be brewing ales and selling them in the tap room and the bar at the back of the development. The tap room will be a public space – we will programme events there but it will be available to hire too (at competitive rates). We want to be a flagship, long-term tenant at The Gas Works. Our ambition is to stay on site for the duration of the temporary phase and then transition over to the final development. That is three years down the line. We'll have up-scaled by then and see no reason why we can't supply our ales to the restaurants, pubs and bars situated on the final development.</p>	
<p>Turnaround Publisher Services</p>	<p>I am writing to you to pledge my support for the Gas Works Project temporary site, and the final Clarendon Gas Works site to be built by St William. Along with the other Directors at Turnaround, I think it is a commendable long-term scheme and we are excited to be part of it.</p> <p>You are probably aware of Turnaround Publisher Services. We like to think of ourselves as a Wood Green business success story. We are an independent company providing services to international corporate and independent publishers. We started in 1984, and moved to Wood Green in 1996. In our 34 years of trading, we have earned and cultivated an esteemed reputation as an internationally renowned company providing first class sales and distribution services to the national international publishing community. Today we</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>employ over 50 full time staff. Many of our employess work in creative and administrative roles.</p> <p>We have been speaking to Nick Hartwright at the Mill Co. Project and Ashley Spearing at St William for a long time about the proposed plans. Both of them have been extremely supportive of use and they recognise the good work we have done.</p> <p>We know that Wood Green is changing and we want to stay where we are and be part of the transformation. Nick and Ashley understand this. Together we have developed a strategy wherein the Turnaround Publisher Services head office stays at the Olympia Trading Estate for the temporary phase of the project, with a view to us moving in to new bespoke permanent offices when the final developed is erected.</p> <p>The scheme offers many benefits to us. It will raise our profile in the community (right now the Olympia Trading Estate is quiet and hidden away), and the rent prices being discussed are very competitive. There are lots of public facing parts of the project that will attract local people – we want to engage more with the local community and get involved in the outreach programmes that will be put on.</p> <p>We firmly believe that this scheme will deliver positive regeneration. We really hope it happens and look forward to being part of it.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
Grow 22	<p>We are Luke Newcombe and Hugh Chapman, co-founders of GROW N22. We're writing to tell you that we give our full support to The Gas Works Project scheme planned for the Olympia Trading Estate in Wood Green.</p> <p>Inspired by projects like Grow Elephant and the Skip Garden at King's Cross, we're working with Nick Hartwright's team to transform the yard area at Olympia Trading into a vibrant garden and community growing space. Our plan is to create a beautiful green space where tenants and visitors to The Gas Works Project can work and relax, complimenting the food offer at the food court space, drink from the brewhouse and events in the events spaces. In the longer term we hope that the GROW N22 initiative at The Gas Works Project can expand into the Haringey Heartlands development.</p> <p>Grow N22 exists to transform unlikely, disused and neglected spaces across Haringey into community gardens and growing spaces made for and by local people. We're a young organisation with big ambition. Luke Newcombe has been managing Westbury Banks Nature Reserve since April 2017. So far there have been 18 sessions involving 30 local volunteers who have given over 350 hours of their time to clear rubbish and create a pathway through the site and tackle the ongoing task of weeding and pruning overgrown shrubs, ferns and trees. Over the course of the past year Luke has also been involved in community gardening</p>	Support noted.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>workshops organised by the Friends of Ally Pally Railway Station, Parkside Malvern Residents Association, and Palace Gates RA. He is also leading a project at New Southgate Railway Station and is supporting Karen Loasby who wants to develop a garden at Blue House Yard. He is a partner in Noel Park Big Local and an active member in the London National Park City Campaign.</p> <p>Since July 2017 Hugh Chapman has been leading a project to create a garden in the car park at Green Rooms Hotel with the help of local volunteers. This project is a partnership between Green Rooms Hotel, Dukes Gardens and Sanctuary Housing. The ‘hard landscaping’ phase of the project is now almost complete and we’re planning a series of community workshops to finish planting the garden, aiming for a public launch in April.</p> <p>Giles Christian is the most recent addition to the Grow N22 team. Whilst a keen amateur gardener he brings his business background to the partnership, focusing on strategy and ensuring a sustainable future for Grow N22. He also looks after stakeholder engagement for Friends of Ally Pally Station and is currently working with Luke on the New Southgate Station partnership with Great Northern.</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
Catherine West MP	<p>Whilst progress has been made since early discussions, there are still a number of changes which should be made:</p> <p>1) Genuinely affordable rent levels (i.e. Council or target/social rent) are still too low. Only 95 households from the housing waiting list in Haringey stand a chance to benefit from this scheme which totals 1,700 new households.</p> <p>2) There is too little provision of three and four bed homes, failing to address Wood Green's high numbers of children living in overcrowded conditions.</p> <p>3) Construction of Block C1 will begin next month if permission is granted at Committee on 12/2/18. The block will contain one hundred flats, none of which contains a single affordable unit.</p>	<p>The one bed and two bed units rents are capped at local housing allowance caps and will provide for local housing need. The level of affordable housing provided is above the level that has been determined to be viable. This is a marked improvement over the extant permission.</p> <p>The three and four bed units are weighted towards the social rented portion.</p> <p>The private tenure of Block C7 was approved under the extant consent. Subject to consent of the new masterplan, St William will submit a phasing plan providing further information of the proposed build sequence and tenure split of each phase across the whole scheme that will set out the proposed delivery of the affordable housing. St William will accept a planning condition on occupation restrictions that</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>4) I have yet to receive reassurances that this Development will not be marketed 'off plan' to overseas investors who will leave flats empty or charge extortionate rents, forcing up the Housing Benefit bill to the public purse.</p> <p>The viability assessment is often quoted as why this large development cannot be done in a more acceptable manner, by providing more social homes, marketing flats to Londoners before overseas investors and building the social units first. However, I understand, that St William, the developer, paid its chief £31million in profits last year, which makes me doubt that the developer is not able to make Development in London viable.</p>	<p>will ensure the delivery of all affordable prior to an agreed proportion of private homes.</p> <p>The Berkeley Group have signed up to the Mayor of London's 'First Dibs for Londoners' initiative in which homes under £350,000 will be marketed to UK buyers for three months before any overseas marketing can take place, with Londoners being offered 'first dibs' upto the first month of this period. Furthermore St William will also commit to ensure that Shared ownership homes will be marketed for the first two months to persons who live or work in Haringey.</p> <p>The viability assessment has been independently assessed on behalf of the GLA and LB Haringey and confirms that as a result of the additional CIL and s106 charges which now apply (£32.5M CIL and £1.4M), the maximum reasonable percentage affordable is 8%. This compares to 24.4% affordable with £8.0M of s106 contribution in the extant permission. The proposal of 32.5% is</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
		therefore providing substantial betterment above the maximum reasonable affordable housing level.

Planning Sub Committee 12 February 2018

ADDENDUM (2) REPORT FOR ITEM 8

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Representation from St. William in response to Parkside Malvern Residents Association (PMRA)

The main issues that St. William have sought to clarify in response to PMRA's objection submission is the legislation that measuring water quality falls under, the most recent testing and the results to be compared with water safety standards that would allow the Moselle to be du-culverted.

The EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' (2006) is the correct governing legislation when assessing water quality. The 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' forms part of the Water Framework Directive. Annex 1 of the EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' provide clear bathing water quality criteria for Inland Waters along for Coastal waters. The applicants have applied the Inland Water quality criteria.

The applicant commissioned further water sampling in January 2018 in line with the testing criteria set out in the EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive'. The analysis of these results were received during week commencing 5th February 2018.

The following table outlines the Inland Waters quality criteria and the results of the January 2018 water sampling of the Moselle Brook.

ANNEX 1 OF THE EU BATHING WATER DIRECTIVE 2006 FOR INLAND WATERS

	Good Quality	Jan 2018 Sample
Intestinal Enterococci (cfu/100ml)	400	7300
Esherichia Coli (cfu/100ml)	1000	4200
Total	1400	11500

The above results from the 2018 sampling shows the current contamination level in comparison as to what is 'good quality' and it is clear that the results far exceed 'good quality' measurement.

The total combine E Coli and Intestinal Enterococci CFU count is 11,500cfu/100ml. This is some 11,100cfu/100ml higher than 'Good Quality' standard. This is eleven times higher than the EU 'Good' standard for inland waters.

The applicants conclude on this point that based on the results it would not be appropriate to pursue detailed proposals at present that would facilitate the daylighting of the Moselle Brook and introduction of a pathway to a public health hazard within a community park in the centre of a 1700 home development.

A further planning condition is proposed that imposes a requirement for an updated Energy Strategy to be submitted prior to the submission of reserved matters. This is to complement the proposed heads of terms which also require a feasibility study to be undertaken to agree the specification of the wider District Energy Network. This further clarifies the requirement to deliver a single site-wide energy network.

Local Representations

A further 46 objections have been received since the first Addendum was published. One objection replaces an earlier email of support.

The main comments include:

- The Moselle should be de-culverted;
- The height of the blocks and overall density;
- Inadequate provision for schools, open spaces, GP surgeries or any other services for new residents;
- Scheme should be reconsidered and less housing built;
- Transport impacts on local roads public transport capacity;
- The proposals for energy centres and lack of details;
- Lack of car parking spaces which will have a knock-on effect locally.

A further 2 letters of support have been received. The main comments include:

- Local businesses, start-ups and creative enterprises will be supported;
- Positive contribution to jobs and economic development;

- The scheme will provide community and open spaces;
- Meanwhile uses will be encouraged during build out.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>The following respondents objected specifically to the proposals for the Moselle (detailed below):</p> <p>78-83 Upper Thames Street, City of London Flat 17 Firs House, Acacia Rd N22 30 Rosecroft, Wood Green London N22 14 Dorset Road Wood Green N22 99 Oakfield Rd, Walthamstow London E17 (x2 separate objections) Haringey Rivers Forum 20 Cranleigh Rd, N15 153 The avenue, Tottenham, London N17 99 Seymour Avenue, N17 158 Dowsett Road, Tottenham, N17 55 Coleridge Road, Crouch End N8 44a Napier Road, Tottenham, N17 10 Warberry Road, N22 49 Cranleigh Road, London, N15 3AH 28 Albany Road N4 12 Woodlands Park Road N15 12 Woodlands Park Road N15 83 Stanley Road N11 44 Amberley Road EN1 47 Langham Road N15 31 Roseberry Gardens 3 Avondale Road N15 83 Wightman Road N4 332 St Ann's Road N15 91 Lausanne Road 11 Malvern Road 304 Mount Pleasant Road</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
<p>5 Malvern Road Flat 27, Kinneer Apartments, Chadwell Lane Craigs Road, Dumfries 28 Kirkstall Avenue 23 Passmore Gardens 16 Richmond Road 115 Seaford Road 54 Kitchener Road, London N17 6DX 16 Richmond Road London N11 2QR 115 Seaford Road (objection and requests that original email of support is withdrawn).</p>		
	<p>The respondent wishes to register an objection to the Haringey Heartlands application to build many hundreds of flats on the site of the old Wood Green gasworks. Haringey's only river, the Moselle Brook, culverted for the past hundred years, runs through this site.</p> <p>The basis of my objection is the intention of the developers to continue to keep the Moselle Brook buried.</p> <p>The Moselle Brook is a main river and part of the Thames river basin, flowing into the River Lea and on to the Thames. As it reaches Wood Green, the river is in a culvert just below the surface.</p> <p>I have recently seen the river as it briefly sees daylight arriving to the development site at the railway embankment. It had a good flow and did not smell. The developers say 'daylighting' the Moselle is not feasible on the basis of quality of water and the on depth of the culvert. These are not valid reasons for keeping this unique and valuable community resource hidden.</p> <p>Thames Water have stated the water quality is already okay. The Moselle Brook is not a drain and Haringey has the legal duty to deal</p>	<p>Under the extant permission (lawfully implementable), the Council accepted none of the alternatives available for de-culverting the River Moselle were acceptable. Officers have carefully considered the proposals against up-to-date planning policy taking into account the applicant's feasibility appraisal and alternative options submitted with this application.</p> <p>Officers have assessed the feasibility against the Council's Development Management Policies, London Plan Policy 7.28 and emerging draft policies.</p> <p>All options would require access to a channel between 2.35m & 3.6m deep. The water quality has been assessed by the developer's consultant and there is an ongoing risk of sewage effluent</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>with the illegal misconnections that are causing the poor quality. Haringey are making excellent progress on addressing these with its partners in Thames Water and expect the quality to improve significantly in the near future. The culvert is not that deep and actually just below the surface in some places on the site. The site can be contoured in other parts of the site with little effort.</p> <p>This development is literally a once in a lifetime opportunity to bring the Moselle back to life by opening it up to daylight. Doing so would increase biodiversity in the Borough and help flood prevention further downstream. It would compensate for the loss of natural habitat that the development will cause. It will lead to improvements in water quality upstream and help the clean-up of the river as it flows through Lordship Rec, and reduce pollution in the River Lea.</p> <p>Daylighting the Moselle would give Haringey's local (and future) residents a real connection with their sense of place and history, and, like neighbouring Enfield Council's Firs Farm Wetlands, it would make a green space that is vibrant and truly alive.</p> <p>Key planning guidance calls for daylighting of culverted rivers. Haringey Heartlands developers would keep the Moselle underground with an option that it could be de-culverted in the future (at no cost to them). This would truly be a case of kicking the issue into the long grass. It will not happen.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated "we believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated main river to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area."</p>	<p>discharge to the Moselle due to storm overflows and/or misconnections. Bacteria counts in excess of 2,420mpn coliforms (most probable number) per 100ml were indicated which indicates the presence of sewage. The guide value for bathing water is 100mpn per 100ml</p> <p>Officers propose S.106 provisions that require the re-testing of water quality prior to commencement and the design allows for future de-culverting should water quality meet the agreed standard. The GLA and Environment Agency have both accepted this position.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>This great opportunity should not be missed. The culvert is over 100 years old and in poor condition in parts- it would be better to spend the money needed to repair or rebuild it on restoring it to be a natural water course that the community can benefit from and manage.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28. The developers should comply with this.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, S113 and S117.</p> <p>I object to this proposal unless de-culverting (daylighting) is incorporated into the permission to proceed.</p>	
Friends of Brunswick Park		
	<p>Friends of Brunswick Park members are frequent visitors to Lordship Rec, and have watched with interest the improvements as a result of de-culverting. The area has become a more vibrant place, the de-culverted Moselle is a beautiful central feature, and it's wonderful to see the benefits for wildlife. And as time passes, the Moselle is becoming noticeably cleaner. It's now a cherished feature of the borough.</p> <p>The East of Haringey is deficient in green space. Any opportunity to remedy this with high quality public realm must be maximised. De-culverting in Haringey Heartlands would create another high quality space that the people of Haringey, and the Council, could be proud</p>	Please see officer response above.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>of. Good for people, good for wildlife. And please remember that de-culverting is promoted in key planning guidance. It's plain to see that the arguments against de-culverting don't stack up, and delaying it to the future means it won't happen. Please do the right thing and make any approval for Haringey Heartlands conditional on daylighting the Moselle now.</p>	
Executive Director – Collage Arts, Chocolate Factory		
	<p>I am writing to inform you that we at Collage Arts give our full support to The Gas Works Project scheme planned for the Olympia Trading Estate in Wood Green. The proposed scheme is vital to the future of the Wood Green Cultural Quarter as it will lead directly to ensuring the future of over 70 creative business and over 200 full time jobs. The 70 creative business are currently located in Chocolate Factory 1, the lease for which comes to an end in summer 2018. If the proposed scheme does go ahead Collage Arts will be moving the 70 creative business into two of the warehouse units at The Gas Works Project.</p> <p>Collage Arts founded the Cultural Quarter concept in Wood Green over 30 years ago in 1985 and has been developing and managing the 3 Chocolate Factory buildings in the Cultural Quarter which are home to over 250 creative companies. The Wood Green Cultural Quarter is now recognised by Haringey Council as a key contributor to the local economy, creating over 800 full-time jobs and a massive range of services and support for local and wider community to participate in the arts, innovative learning programmes for unemployed young people, BAME Women, people recovering from mental health issues, the LGBT community and the elderly. We offer business support services for start-up businesses, and a wide range of affordable facilities and resources from recording, rehearsal,</p>	Support noted.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>dance, theatre studios to screening, training, workshop spaces.</p> <p>For the 70 creative companies and for Collage Arts, The Gas Works Project is a godsend. We can remain in the Wood Green Cultural Quarter and continue to do the sterling work that we do. Naturally, the scheme has our full and unwavering support. It has to happen. We have to protect the many and varied artistic practitioners in Wood Green who have done so much for the local community.</p>	
134 Station Road, N22 7SX		
	<p>I am objecting to the revised application for Heartlands development. The number, density and height of the homes would be of an unacceptable level and this latest application increases it yet again. I am concerned about the impact on the local area of such a large high density development. There is a lack of clarity about additional infrastructure to deal with increased traffic and pressure on local services. With the current uncertainty of the HDV due to the current political climate I am concerned that the short term solution to all of Haringey's housing problems is trying to be solved in this development to detriment of local residents.</p>	<p>The full environmental impact of the development, including social infrastructure, has been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and is judged to be acceptable. The transport impacts are assessed in the main body of the report.</p>
67 Hornsey Park Road N8 0JU		
	<p>I object to the planning notice as I feel these 18 storey flats are going to completely block my light and be totally overbearing. I also worry about the impact it will have on the community in terms of traffic and local amenities. I fear the disruption and noise it will cause and worry about the possible danger the increased traffic will cause.</p>	<p>The full daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment is addressed in the main body of the report. The proposed development achieves a high level of adherence against BRE standards and is judged to be acceptable. The development is adequately sited away from existing residents so to avoid any overbearing impacts.</p>
8 Rhodes Avenue		

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>I object to this. This is a unique, once in a life time opportunity to unearth and expose the Mosselle river. Enlightened city authorities all over the world do this. Brings a proper sense of space to a location for future residents to enjoy and can be transformative for an area in terms of attractiveness.</p> <p>Bigger scale granted but have a look at the pictures in the attached from the town of Aarhus, Denmark where I went to university. Unearthing the river here transformed a city centre: http://m.aarhus.lokalavisen.dk/dengang-og-nuaarhus-blev-foedt-ved-aen-/20150817/artikler/708129958/1449</p>	<p>Please see officer response above.</p>
24 Park Ridings N8 OLD		
	<p>I strongly object to this development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is wholly out of character with the surrounding area. 2. The scale of the development is such that huge pressure will be placed on already congested roads and is likely to significantly negatively impact road safety and parking for local residents. 3. The size and scale of the development is such that it will lead to significant over-shadowing, intrusion into private spaces and areas and create significant disturbance in terms of noise and pollution. 4. As a consequence of the above the development will degrade the quality of life for everyone living in the area. 	<p>The proposal would result in a development of varying designs including taller buildings that would contrast with existing built form in a positive way within the locality. In tandem, the development has been designed in order to not result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of surrounding occupiers.</p> <p>The full transport impacts, including road traffic, is addressed in the main body of the report.</p>
Parkside Malvern Residents Association		
	<p>I write on behalf of Parkside Malvern Residents Association (PMRA), the registered residents association covering Hornsey Park Road, Alexandra Road, Park Ridings, Malvern Road, Ravenstone Road and The Avenue, N8 in response to the Council's consultation on the application. The views expressed in this letter are those of the</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Committee and the membership.</p> <p>We would like to register the strongest possible objection to the proposed development as detailed below. The wider membership will also have individual concerns which, while not covered by this letter will have been communicated to you directly.</p> <p>We have written under separate cover with our more detailed objection and met with St. William on 6th February, 2018 to discuss them and seek to resolve as many as possible. The unnecessary and unacceptable haste with which this application has been brought to committee has prevented this essential and valuable dialogue between developer and community taking place. We also believe it is a dialogue the council should have been facilitating instead of forcing the application by reference to the Planning Performance Agreement. A summary of our objections follows:</p> <p>1. Timing: We believe the application is not yet ready for determination and requires a considerable amount of further work and review before a decision can be reached.</p> <p>We believe it is inappropriate to determine this excessively intensive and dense proposal so soon after the failure of the AAP and the failure to obtain certainty on the delivery of Crossrail 2, the major transport and infrastructure project upon which the AAP was predicted.</p>	<p>The application has been fully assessed in accordance with agreed performance standards.</p> <p>The Council is now consulting on a revised 'Preferred Options' Area Action Plan for the Wood Green Area following on from an initial 'Preferred Option' consultation in Spring 2017. The application has been assessed against the most up-to-date planning policy framework.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>2. Localism: We object to the failure of HBC and as a result of this, the failure of the application to respect the ideals and processes under the Localism Act, 2011.</p> <p>3. Development relies on/ must Include infrastructure The intensity of development relies on and will fail in the absence of essential infrastructure at the boundaries of and beyond the site.</p> <p>4. Alexandra Palace and Park We object to the appropriation of Alexandra Park as essential open space to support the proposed density of development and the failure of the application to deliver detailed, costed and legally binding proposals to create the long needed and frequently promised connection between Wood Green and the Park through the water</p>	<p>The application has been subject to extensive statutory consultation. In addition, the application is supported by a Statement of Community Involvement (by the applicant) detailing formal consultation and engagement for the revised proposals starting in January 2017. Two workshops were held, the first took place on 27 January 2017 and the second on 3 February 2017 and a presentation was given to a PMRA General Meeting on 9 February 2017. In addition two public exhibitions were held, newsletters distributed and a project website set up.</p> <p>The impact on infrastructure is addressed in the main body of the report. The application includes a substantial amount of community floorspace (D1/D2).</p> <p>The open space provision and transport impacts, including mitigation for walking and cycling improvements is addressed in the main body of the report which also includes significant bus contributions.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>works.</p> <p>We object to the adverse visual impact of the proposed tall building/ building line and mass proposed by the Outline application.</p> <p>5. Error in calculation of site area The site area incorrectly includes the area of Mary Neuner Road, a public road consented to under planning permission in 2007. The site area also includes an existing electrical substation - land owned by the Distribution Network Operator, serving the neighbouring community. Further, the space in front of the new PRS.</p> <p>6. Excessive density We calculate the area of the Detailed application to be c 1.31ha. Based on the proposed number of units being 616, we calculate this to be 470 units/ha. We calculate the area of the Outline application to be c 2.44ha. based on the number of units being 1098, we calculate this to be 450 units/ha. Both densities are far in excess of the London Plan and, given the site constraints, far beyond what is acceptable for a sustainable healthy community.</p> <p>Overall, contrary to the London plan, the application and design fails</p>	<p>Visual impact has been assessed in the THVIA section of the Environmental Assessment and considered not detrimental to neighbouring streets, nearby open spaces including Alexandra Park and on Local Views; officers agree with the assessment.</p> <p>The PRS and its environs, whilst a constraint, forms part of the masterplan and is not incorrect.</p> <p>The London Plan (paragraph 3.28) makes clear that the density matrix should not be applied mechanistically and is particularly concerned to ensure that the quality of housing output is not compromised by the need to make the most efficient use of land. Officers have reviewed the proposals in their entirety and judge the residential quality to be a significant improvement on the extant scheme.</p> <p>The employment space is welcomed and supported, providing job opportunities for the community and also adheres with planning policies.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>to address how the excessively high density will tackle spatial and environmental inequalities. The quantum of employment and other town space is excessive compared to the consented scheme and without precedence.</p> <p>Access to underground car parks, service compounds and collections points together with on street parking will have a seriously detrimental impact on building frontages and the character of the area.</p> <p>7. Failure to daylight the Moselle Brook across the Detailed Application Land Appendix 4 - Moselle Brook Daylighting Feasibility Study contains factual errors and is deliberately misleading. It refers to the site in its 2009 condition when it has since undergone ground remediation and makes multiple references to historic and not current data.</p> <p>The option to restore the river has not been clearly presented, costed, risk assessed and confirmed as deliverable. With respect to water quality, the reference year should be 2020.</p> <p>The economic case for opening the river now should have been established instead of relying on loose statements not based on fact. The technical case for opening the river now has also not been</p>	<p>The amount of space and active frontage taken up by underground car park entrances, service compounds and collection points are not considered excessive. Underground parking is preferable in design terms to large amounts of the ground and street frontages being taken up by parking. Collection points only used once every two weeks for refuse collections; designed to be pleasant placed the rest of the time. The access proposals are also addressed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Please see officer response at front of this addendum.</p> <p>The open space and other key design</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>properly investigated.</p> <p>The suggestion that the river could be de-culverted in future is high risk, expensive and is unlikely to ever be delivered.</p> <p>8. Lack of open space There is insufficient open space for the density and intensity of development. We disagree with the Design Officer's conclusion that there is a generous range of different external amenity space - balconies, roofs, open space between buildings or Alexandra Park which is remote and not just west of the site as stated. The so called pocket park is part byway, an essential pedestrian and cycle link from the development towards Wood Green and Turnpike Lane in the east and, for the existing community Alexandra Park in the west it will be a long walk from the front doors of tall buildings and an unattractive and unviable one for people of most ages before arriving at the remotest end of Alexandra Park/Newlands Fields.</p> <p>The park either side of Mary Neuner Road is also connecting space but as part of the London wide Blue Ribbon network, of borough-wide significance, it should be provided for the benefit of Wood Green and Hornsey in addition as well as a local park for the development and play space.</p> <p>The area above the Moselle culvert at the rear of Hornsey Park Road must be included in the Detailed application, protected and delivered to perform this function at the time that the Outline application development is delivered.</p> <p>The space above the Moselle behind Hornsey Park Road has not been properly surveyed and its constraints established. It is impinged</p>	<p>proposals including the public square are addressed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>This area will be covered by Reserved Matters Applications and sufficient</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>upon by Zone D and of insufficient width to contain a viable shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists, as suggested. It should also be shown as connecting to the part of the Blue Ribbon on the adjacent Iceland site.</p> <p>We note that the word river does not once appear in the Design officer's report and the opportunity and benefits daylighting are not mentioned a telling omission.</p> <p>The Outline application fails to establish the impact of raised ground levels on proposed development in Zone D and properties in Hornsey Park Road, the potential to retain trees when the culvert requires repair and access by the public as part of the Blue Ribbon.</p> <p>The civic square within the Outline application area is pitifully small, will lack daylight and oppressive and totally lacks functionality. It will be compromised by its location above the northern energy centre. We object to any appropriation of CIL for Alexandra Park where this is the result of the deficiency of open space within the development.</p> <p>The application does not robustly respond to and ensure the delivery of the S.106 Agreement with Network Rail for the railway embankment to be an open space within Heartlands.</p> <p>9. Failure to make preserve and enhance the site's Heritage Assets. The key heritage assets of the site are still not at the heart of the proposals. The assets are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Moselle Brook and the restoration of its riparian nature b) Incorporation and celebration of the gas holder bases - http://www.ribacompetitions.com/gasholder/ c) Restoration of the polychromatic brick wall to the western 	<p>controls are considered to be in place to guide future detailed design and delivery.</p> <p>The application includes a Survey Report. The technical consultants' survey judges the overall condition to be Grade 2 (good) indicating that the asset is structurally sound with some minor defects that are not currently reducing performance of the asset.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These have already been demolished. The Cultural strategy discusses ways in which the local heritage would be interpreted and represented within the Master Plan. For example, the layout of the play fountains would reference the geometry of the gas</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>boundary of the Detailed application area</p> <p>d) Restoration of the brick abutments to the railway embankment (the rail head for delivery of coal for gas manufacture)</p> <p>e) manufacture)</p> <p>f) The retaining wall and bund between the Moselle culvert and Zone D and properties on Hornsey park Road</p> <p>g) Assimilation of artefacts from the former gas holders</p>	<p>holders (Page 36, Cultural Strategy). In addition, page 39 goes on to explain how an evocative memorial to the gas holders could be achieved throughout the development. For example <i>'The imagined reflection of the gas holders would be permanently applied to the glazing, via sandblasting, etching or a photographic interlayer.'</i> The strategy also incorporates Geodesic light projections to create the shadows of the gas holder on the Civic Square.</p> <p>The wall being referred to here is of low quality and not of sufficient heritage value apart from being a physical demarcation. It would be onerous to ask for the restoration of the wall in this instance.</p> <p>This section of the abutments are likely to be managed by Network Rail. Again, I do not think it has sufficient heritage value and that it would be onerous if we were to ask for this to be restored.</p> <p>Page 35 of the Cultural strategy states how the salvaged elements of the gas holder, in particular those relating to the patented design of Gas holder N1, will be displayed within publicly accessible spaces wherever possible. These matters are addressed</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="546 384 1361 416">10. Transport and adverse impact on Hornsey Park Road</p> <p data-bbox="546 459 1514 746">The application fails to address and correct HBC's failure to meet its commitment to the local community to ensure that traffic is equitably distributed between Hornsey park Road and Mary Neuner Road and the assertion that the lower than expected use of the latter can be a benefit taken by the proposed development. We object to the proposal to narrow Mary Neuner Road and to roadside parking and any interventions that could see its capacity to carry its fair share of local traffic.</p> <p data-bbox="546 790 1518 1045">The application has failed to identify and respond to the adverse impact of service and delivery vehicles and HGVs using Hornsey Park Road that will harm the environment and the health and wellbeing of residents The application has failed to allow for an improved junction between Coburg and Mary Neuner Road to permit traffic to flow easily between these roads as part of an equitable distribution of local traffic through the area.</p> <p data-bbox="546 1088 1514 1232">The application must include the creation of a shared service and environmental improvements between the Pocket Park and Hornsey Park Road as part of the Detailed application, to be undertaken by the developer.</p> <p data-bbox="546 1275 1496 1375">The application fails to recognise that the intensity of development requires significant improvement of the junction of Clarendon Road and Hornsey Park Road and the integration of signals between this</p>	<p data-bbox="1554 236 2002 300">elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1554 411 2128 513">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1554 778 2128 880">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1554 1114 2128 1216">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1554 1337 2128 1369">These matters are addressed</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>junction and those between Hornsey Park Road and Turnpike Lane. The application fails to respond to HBC policy SP7 and has an unacceptable reliance on only a commitment by HBC to promote infrastructure improvements that are not in their gift to deliver.</p> <p>We object to the conclusions of the Transport Assessment: That while the proposed development results in some addition traffic at local junctions within the study network that all of the junctions continue to work within capacity and the proposed development does not have a severe impact on their performance. That the Piccadilly line has spare capacity at peak times to accept significantly more users to and from Wood Green and Turnpike Lane stations: the experience of residents and works is otherwise. We object to the casual conclusions of the Transport Assessment with respect to the condition and capacity of existing Links and Crossings, e.g. Link 5 and Crossing 1 to function following development.</p> <p>The application fails to acknowledge and respond to the increased pressure of the CPZ in Hornsey Park Road and neighbouring streets, particularly with respect to visitors and out of hours parking.</p> <p>11. Proposed Energy Centres and strategy The application contains incomplete analysis in support of the proposed northern energy centre. This is a costly and high risk HBC project that is appropriating essential CIL funding for a purpose for which it was not intended.</p> <p>We note the proposed District Heat Network contains no resilience planning, i.e. there is a reliance of a single flow and return pipe and no ring and the network will rely on one energy building. It is unlikely</p>	<p>elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>Provision for the DEN and related infrastructure forms part of the Council's CIL Regulation 123 list.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>to be an acceptable source of heat without individual developments having their own back-up. It relies on routes that are subject to consultation under the AAP and may never be created.</p> <p>Proposals for the southern energy centre to support the Detailed application are incomplete.</p> <p>Please present all the objections to the planning subcommittee member. We ask that as a minimum a decision on the application is deferred until a full and proper discussion has taken place with the community on all objections.</p>	<p>The legal agreement includes provision for a Feasibility Assessment relating to the district heat network in the north, which will assess these matters and will be subject to future detailed design. A further planning condition is proposed to secure an updated energy strategy and further clarify the requirement for a single site-wide network that connects into the Wood Green DEN. The energy centre in the south has been reduced in size and is now a temporary centre that will be decommissioned upon connection to the wider DEN.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
27 Warberry Road N22 7TQ		
	<p>I object to this application on the grounds that there have been far too many applications of this kind and while everyone understands that we need more housing, more effort should first be made to put into use houses left empty for long periods, as is already under consideration in some areas. Also, the Council rarely seems to properly consider the infrastructure to support such housing, which often remains the same: Wood Green alone has seen many developments over the last 20 years, yet the number of tube stations, bus services, GP surgeries and other vital infrastructure constituents remain the same. This all puts undue pressure on this infrastructure, leading to stress for people trying to use them.</p> <p>Another issue, though, is that such developments would be greatly improved by the factoring in of natural resources, in this case the Moselle River, which should be de-culverted as part of development if it takes place. Research has shown that being close to nature is good for our health, especially mental health, whereas living surrounded by a concrete jungle is not. Exposing (daylighting) the river would enable residents to enjoy that open space and benefit from its potential to promote connectedness within the community, besides the benefits accruing to wildlife. It just won't work to say the de-culverting would happen at a later stage, as realistically it won't happen. I urge the Council, if approval is given to this proposal, to insist on de-culverting the Moselle as a condition of such development. Thanks for reading and reflecting on our comments.</p>	<p>The application has been assessed against up-to-date planning policy at a local and strategic level. The impact on infrastructure is also assessed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum.</p>
26 Hawthorn Road		
	<p>This is a massive overdevelopment of the land available - blocks of flats of up to 19 storeys in height are an anathema to family living.</p>	<p>Matters relating to the proposed density and design are addressed in the main</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>They increase the incidence of mental health issues and militate against safety of children and older people. Have we learned no lessons from the 1960s when such tower blocks were pulled down in favour of more human-sized building?</p> <p>The whole project needs rethinking. In any case no development on this site should take place unless the River Moselle is deculverted in order to bring back at least some refreshment and wildlife to the area.</p>	body of the report.
Books to Buy Ltd, Coburg Road		
	<p>I run a business called Books 2 Buy. We are dealing with new books also antique and rear old books. I think that The Gas Works scheme planned for the Olympia Trading Estate sounds great. It will make the area much better. At the moment there is very little going on, hardly anyone knows where we are and we don't really feel part of the community. Everything happens on the High Street and around the big council building on the corner of Station Road.</p> <p>I understand that there will be a café, a bar and public event spaces at The Gas Works that will bring lots of people to the area. This is exactly what's needed.</p>	Support noted.
11 Malvern Road		
	<p>I am writing to object to this planning application for 5 reasons:</p> <p>1. DENSITY & BUILDING HEIGHTS: The density and proposed height of buildings has increased significantly on previous applications related to this site. As a result, the quality of the development and impact on future and neighbouring residents is likely to be negative. The affordability of new properties is likely to be beyond the reach of many Wood Green families. There does need not seem to be sufficient allocations of social housing</p>	These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>needed to address Haringey's current housing needs.</p> <p>2. LACK OF OPEN SPACE: A consequence of the above is insufficient open spaces which are essential to the long term well-being of the new and existing communities.</p> <p>3. INFRASTRUCTURE: The increased number of residents will put extreme pressure on the local infrastructure housing, education, social welfare facilities, and transport. There seems to be little joined up assessment of impact of thousands of additional residents and workers coming into the new development.</p> <p>Hornsey Park Road residents will be under severe pressure and there seems to be little recognition of the consequential health and negative environmental impact on local residents.</p> <p>Local tube, bus and train services are already overcrowded.</p> <p>4. THE MOSELLE: The application makes reference to the future potential to open up the Moselle, this will not be realised if it is not part of the new development at its onset. The opening of the river would benefit this and other communities across the borough. Permission should only be granted on condition that the Moselle is opened up. Haringey needs to support local communities more proactively in their efforts to improve the environment.</p> <p>5. HEARTLANDS & AAP VISION: I acknowledge that the developer has tried to be sensitive to community concerns in many aspects of the application. However, St William are under pressure to deliver more work spaces and homes in an area where there simply isn't sufficient space. There is a real danger of the new development</p>	<p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>undermining the well-being of future and neighbouring communities. This appears contrary in many ways to the intentions and vision in the area action plan which aims to make the Wood Green area an attractive and desirable place to live and work in.</p>	
5 Malvern Road		
	<p>We object to the density of development in the outline area and lack of open space. It is not acceptable for this development to rely on access to Alexandra Park when it is so far away - it is not practical to expect residents of such a vast estate to travel 0.75km along twisting, narrow and in places unpleasant paths to get to proper open space. Worse, this open space is pretty barren and sometimes fenced off for events.</p> <p>We object to the impact the development will have on surrounding roads, especially Hornsey Park Road.</p> <p>Any proposals must include Mary Neuner Road taking its fair share of all traffic through the area (half of all traffic) and promised by Haringey when the new road was built. Proposals include Hornsey Park Road being traffic calmed and weight restrictions introduced to stop HGVs using it.</p> <p>There must be a transparent agreement on all S.106 works and application of CIL agreed with the community (not just the developer) to create the essential infrastructure needed to support this development: priorities must be a link to Alexandra park, extending the New River Path to Wood Green Common, traffic calming Hornsey Park Road and incorporation of the Coronation Sidings embankment as open space.</p> <p>The heritage assets of the site must be part of the planning of the</p>	<p>A number of improvements to walking and cycling routes are proposed as part of a range of mitigation measures. Please see transport section in main report.</p> <p>Please see transport section.</p> <p>Please see main body of report for CIL contributions and planning obligations.</p> <p>Please see response at front of this</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>site, the most important of which is opening the Moselle Brook from as part of the Detailed phase (the southern area): we note that the application reports and data contain serious inaccuracies and that, were officers and the GLA to have examined the matter, they would have seen the errors. It is now clear that the council and developer agree the river can be opened and that the remaining concern is one of water quality. Even on this point, the application contains inaccuracies and errors and has clearly misled officers and the GLA. The errors and inaccuracies must be corrected and the GLA asked to withdraw their erroneous opinion. The daylighting must be designed and costed now and the funding of the work agreed between Haringey and the applicant and the works made a condition to be complied with within two years. The gas holder bases and wall next to the railway also need incorporating into the development.</p> <p>We object because the so called Moselle Walk has not been proposed as part of the first phase. It is an essential natural space and acknowledge buffer and screen between Hornsey Park Road properties and the dense development in the Outline area. This linear green space is also needed to connect the southern Detailed area from the point when it is first occupied and is needed by the local community which is an area of open space deficiency. As a haven for nature, for the existing and new community as it arrives and as a protection to existing properties during the construction phase of the Outline (the densest area of development) the walk needs creating in a near final form from the start of the development.</p>	<p>addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p>