

Kodi Sprott, Principal
Committee
Coordinator

020 8489 5343

kodi.sprott@haringey.gov.uk

21 January 2025

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Monday, 13th January, 2025

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

8. HGY/2023/0894 27-31 GARMAN ROAD N17 0UP (PAGES 1 - 10)

Proposal: Erection of two replacement units designed to match the original units following fire damage and demolition of the original units.

Yours sincerely

Kodi Sprott, Principal Committee Coordinator
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

1. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**
2. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 13th January 2025**ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEMS****UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8**

Reference No: HGY/2023/0894	Ward: Northumberland Park
<p>Address: 27-31 Garman Road N17 0UP</p> <p>Proposal: Redevelopment of the site by the erection of 2 warehouse units (Use Class B8) with ancillary office space, and associated refuse and recycling bins storage and cycle parking; following a fire and demolition of 2 Use Class B8 warehouse units. (Amended description)</p> <p>Applicant: Nachum Pshemich</p>	

Corrected Description of Proposal: The description has been amended to read as follows, ensuring reference to the Use Classes Order:

Redevelopment of the site by the erection of 2 warehouse units (Use Class B8) with ancillary office space, and associated refuse and recycling bins storage and cycle parking; following a fire and demolition of 2 Use Class B8 warehouse units.

Corrected paragraph 4.1.1 – Under **External Consultees**, London Fire Brigade did not respond to the consultation.

Corrected the numbering: The numbering for Internal/External Consultees should read as follows:

Internal

- 1) LBH Transport
- 2) LBH Carbon
- 3) LBH Waste Management
- 4) LBH Building Control
- 5) LBH Pollution Air Quality
- 6) LBH Inclusive Economy
- 7) LBH Design
- 8) LBH Pollution
- 9) Cllr Bevan

External

- 10) Thames Water
- 11) London Fire Brigade
- 12) Designing Out of Crime

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 9

Reference No: HGY/2024/2279	Ward: Noel Park
Address: 25-27 Clarendon Road N8 0DD Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and delivery of a co-living development and affordable workspace, alongside public realm improvements, soft and hard landscaping, cycle parking, servicing and delivery details and refuse and recycling provision. Applicant: Mr Richard Quelch, Q Square	

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**Parking and Highways**Cycle Parking

Paragraph 6.7.11 is amended (in full) to correct the sentence as follows:

In terms of the co-living component of the proposal, 167 long stay spaces and no short stay spaces are proposed. Two long-stay and 1 short-stay cycle parking spaces are proposed for the commercial units. The applicant will be required to provide 167 long-stay cycle parking spaces for residents (co-living) and for the commercial unit (affordable workspace) 3 long-stay and 1 short stay cycle spaces. The short-stay cycle parking must be provided outside of the building but within the curtilage of the site as by definition the long-stay must be secure, and visitors should not be able to gain entry to the bike stores. The 18 Brompton bike lockers do not provide enough variety or flexibility of use given that they can only be used for the storage of Brompton bikes. The details of cycle parking, including the shortfall in long-stay cycle parking for the commercial unit (affordable workspace) in line with the London Plan and the London Cycle Design Standards (LCDS), can be adequately addressed at the further detailed design stage, and as such this matter can be secured by the imposition of a condition.

The design and arrangement of all cycle parking will need to meet the requirements of TfL's London Cycle Design Standards.

As such, the cycle parking is acceptable subject to the relevant condition/legal agreement being imposed in respect of proposed cycle parking arrangements.

Sustainability, Energy and Climate ChangeCarbon Reduction

Paragraph 6.8.9 is amended (in bold) to correct the amount of monies in the sentence as follows:

Overall, the amount of carbon to be offset (once connected to the proposed DEN) would be 52.3 tonnes per year. Based on 30-years of annual carbon dioxide emissions costed at £95 per tonne, this amounts to **£152,475** including a 10% management fee).

ALTERATIONS TO CONDITIONS:

3 External Materials (PRE CONSTRUCTUON)

No **above ground works** shall take place other than investigative, demolition and site clearance work until full details of external materials are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out solely in accordance with the approved details (or such alternative details the Local Planning Authority may approve in writing).

Reason: To safeguard and enhance the visual amenities of the locality in compliance with Policies DM1 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

ALTERATIONS TO INFORMATIVES:

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £523,222.40 (7,360sqm x £71.09) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,986,758.4 (7,360sqm x £269.94). These rates are based on the Annual CIL Rate Summary for 2025 in accordance with the published Annual CIL Rate Summary for 2025. This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the RICS CIL Index. ~~An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge~~

ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION COMMENTS:

Further comments have been received from Transport for London (dated 08 January 2025), as follows:

NB: (All TfL comments have been included for purposes of the appendices)

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
EXTERNAL		
Transport for London	<p>Comments dated 08/01/2025</p> <p>Thanks for the further discussion and information relating to loading and servicing and provision of disabled persons parking.</p> <p>I understand the revised proposal to provide an on-street inset bay on Clarendon Road suitable for two cars,</p>	<p>Observations have been taken into account. The recommended legal agreement clauses and conditions will be included in line with</p>

	<p>one of which would be for a disabled persons parking space, and other amendments to double yellow lines, and why this inset bay could not be formally set out as a loading bay.</p> <p>I understand the likely trip generation for delivery and servicing vehicles, and TfL guidance advises on the opportunities to consolidate deliveries to reduce trip generation. TfL will support the provision to be secured through cycling and delivery and servicing planning conditions to ensure that provision is made for short stay cycle parking provision suitable for oversized bicycles and cargo bikes.</p> <p>I am satisfied that the combined package of S278 highway works for this site, and also for the site opposite at 30-36 Clarendon Road with its own S278 highway works, as well as other ongoing works which are currently being delivered on Mary Neuner Road and Clarendon Road to accommodate the extension of bus route 91 and N91, all of which Haringey officers will lead on, will address matters to ensure that the operation of the bus network would not be significantly affected. TfL will be pleased to assist with any detailed matters for access for buses.</p> <p>Bus stops must not be used for waiting or deliveries during any construction or occupation phase of the proposed development.</p> <p>As such, with the mitigation being secured through S278 and a delivery and servicing plan condition, among other conditions (and the earlier clarifications and responses made on cycle parking) TfL would not object to this application being approved.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact if I can be of any further assistance in determining this application</p> <p>Comments dated 06/11/2024</p> <p>The applicant's comments clarify matters, and re cycle parking and</p>	<p>the planning obligations SPD.</p>
--	---	--------------------------------------

	<p>provision, subject to a condition of details of cycle parking and strategy for access to cycle parking (eg use of fobs / passes) in line with LCDS, no further comments from TfL.</p> <p>Comments dated 14/10/2024</p> <p>Thank you for consulting TfL Spatial Planning, and apologies for the delayed response.</p> <p><u>Trip generation and impact</u></p> <p>It is disappointing that the applicant has not carried out a station analysis in line with TfL TA guidance. The TA states incorrectly that the peak service on the Piccadilly line through Turnpike Lane station has trains running every 4-5 minutes, whereas the true figure is every 2.5 minutes i.e. 24 trains per hour. There are no current plans for significant improvements to the station, and TfL does not seek a contribution towards the Underground network or at Turnpike Lane station.</p> <p>TfL are planning to operate bus routes 91 and N91 on Clarendon Road and Mary Neuner Road – further background is available here https://haveyoursay.tfl.gov.uk/haringey-heartlands. The trips generated by this development will not require capacity enhancements on route 91 or N91, nor on routes 41 and 144 on Turnpike Lane.</p> <p>The TA includes an Active Travel Zone (ATZ) assessment. The highways and public realm in the vicinity of the site are mainly borough roads and any highway intervention would be carried out by Haringey. Given the car-free nature of the scheme but also the one parking space proposed disabled people, walking and wheeling routes to nearby facilities will need to be enhanced. We would support LB Haringey securing a contribution towards local highway and public realm interventions to enhance local connectivity in the vicinity of the site, in line with London Plan Policies T2 and T4.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>Highway proposals</u></p> <p>LB Haringey are planning to install new bus stops on Mary Neuner Road (and elsewhere within the Heartlands site) but not immediately adjacent to this site on Clarendon Road (new stops on Mary Neuner Road further north will provide reasonable separation from stops E and H on Turnpike Lane).</p> <p>The Council is also planning additional highway changes to help facilitate the introduction of the bus routes, and this includes an extension of existing double yellow lines at the junction of Clarendon Road and Mary Neuner Road. The applicant's plans to install a loading bay do not appear to comply with the Council's plans to retain and extend the existing double yellow lines and may result in delays to buses.</p> <p>TfL would object to this element of the application on the basis of adverse impact on bus operations. We would be pleased to discuss this further with LB Haringey and the applicant how the loading and servicing and disabled persons parking for this site can be delivered. Any further work should include swept paths for vehicles and for buses based on a 12m electric vehicle, rather than just refuse lorries and cars. No Road Safety Audit has been submitted with this application and one may be required to assess the proposals and how occupiers of the site and background users may use or cross the highway in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p><u>Car parking</u></p> <p>The provision for a "car-free" scheme is in line with London Plan standards – "Large-scale purpose-built shared living, student accommodation and other sui generis residential uses should be car-free." however the provision for such a scheme also need to be in line with London Plan which sets out that "Disabled persons parking should be provided in accordance with the levels set out in <u>Table 10.6</u>, ensuring that all non-residential elements should provide</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>access to at least one on or off-street disabled persons parking bay” As such a co-living proposal is going to be residential rather than non-residential, which would lend itself to 3% provision from the outset. The applicant has justified the nature of occupiers of the site based on likely age group demographics at one per cent of units with the provision of two disabled persons parking space, however this is intended to be shared with servicing and it will need to be clarified how this area could operate to safely allow access and servicing, and not obstruct bus operations, as well as how requests from eligible occupiers for a car parking space would be met, besides the TS paragraph 5.4.6 “ In the unlikely event of disabled parking demands arising above that expected, disabled users would be able to park on-street within existing on-street parking bays within the CPZ as long as a valid blue badge is displayed and without time limit. This would be in accordance with LBH’s online guidance for disabled drivers.” TfL would support at this location a low amount of disabled persons car parking, on the basis of other contributions towards active travel and healthy streets being secured, and to avoid affecting the operation of the bus network</p> <p>All residents must be prohibited from applying for an on-street parking permit, except for eligible occupiers.</p> <p><u>Cycle parking</u></p> <p>The design includes a locker for folding bicycles within the bicycle store and as part of the calculation of cycle parking spaces. London Plan policy 10.5.9 sets out that <i>“The provision of space for folding bicycles is generally not an acceptable alternative to conventional cycle parking. An exception may be applied in office developments in the CAZ, where the location of rail termini lends itself to greater levels of folding bicycle use. This should only be applied for up to 10 per cent of long-stay spaces and where the full provision could not otherwise be provided. Provision of cycle hire caters for a different market of cyclist and also should not be accepted in lieu of cycle parking.”</i> The</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>provision of folding bicycles for this land use is not in line with London Plan policy, and the applicant should identify how provision for standard parking (be it in single or double tier design) can be incorporated into the development. The proportion within the total of five per cent larger adaptive spaces and fifteen per cent Sheffield stands is welcomed.</p> <p><u>Other matters</u></p> <p>The site is adjacent to a railway corridor and the views of Network Rail as infrastructure owner should be sought</p> <p>Matters such as construction logistics, delivery and servicing plans, Travel Plans should include final versions to be secured by conditions or obligation</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>The applicant will need to update proposals for cycle parking.</p> <p>Given the potential impact on the operation of the bus network, TfL would object to this application, and we will be pleased to discuss this further with LB Haringey and TfL to resolve how an acceptable on-highway loading and servicing bay and provision for disabled persons parking is secured which will not affect the operation of the bus network.</p>	
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank