

MINUTES OF MEETING Planning Sub Committee HELD ON Tuesday, 18th July, 2023, 7.00 - 9.03 pm

PRESENT:

Councillors: Barbara Blake (Chair), Reg Rice (Vice-Chair), Nicola Bartlett, John Bevan, Cathy Brennan, George Dunstall, Emine Ibrahim, Sue Jameson, Sean O'Donovan, Alexandra Worrell and Luke Cawley-Harrison

ALSO ATTENDING: Valerie Okeiyi, Planning Officer, Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning, Rob Krzyszowski, Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability, Placemaking & Housing, Kodi Sprott, Principal Committee Coordinator, James Dawe, Planning Officer, Justin Farley, Senior Lawyer, Suzanne Kimman, Climate Change Manager, Richard Trusscot, Principal Urban Design Officer

1. FILMING AT MEETINGS

The Chair referred to the notice of filming at meetings and this information was noted.

2. PLANNING PROTOCOL

The Chair referred to the planning protocol and this information was noted.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Emery and in accordance with Committee Standing Orders 53 to 56 Councillor Cawley-Harrison was in attendance as a substitute. He carried full voting rights in accordance with Committee Standing Order 59.

4. URGENT BUSINESS

There were no items of urgent business.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 9, HGY/2022/2116 – THE GOODS YARD AND THE DEPOT – 36 & 44-52 WHITE HART LANE (AND LAND TO THE REAR) AND 867-869 HIGH ROAD (AND LAND TO THE REAR) N17 8EY (PAGES 181-590) Cllr Ibrahim noted that she was an Arsenal supporter and a member of AISA (Arsenal Independent Supporters' Association). She stated that she considered this non-prejudicial and would therefore take part in the discussion, voting, and would be considering the item with an open mind. She would also take all material

planning considerations into account. Cllr Bevan and Cllr Jameson also noted that they were members of a group which meets with Spurs on a regular basis to discuss operational aspects within the stadium. Both considered this to be a non-prejudicial personal interest and therefore confirmed that they would take part in the discussion, voting, and would be considering the item with an open mind. They would take all of the material planning considerations into account.

6. MINUTES

Minutes 11th May 5th June, 3rd of July supplementary pack. APPROVED

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

8. HGY/2022/2116 - HORNSEY POLICE STATION, 98 TOTTENHAM LANE, N8 7EJ

Valerie Okeyi, Planning Officer introduced the report for: Retention of existing Police Station building (Block A) with internal refurbishment, rear extensions and loft conversions to create 6 terrace houses and 4 flats. Erection of two buildings comprising of Block C along Glebe Road and Harold Road to create 8 flats and erection of Block B along Tottenham Lane and towards the rear of Tottenham Lane to create 7 flats and 4 mews houses including landscaping and other associated works.

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

- The Planning Officer reiterated that the building was a good design. The detail of the design concept of Block B had a weaving pattern and a flat roof which expressed that it was a modern building, whilst fitting in with the Edwardian surroundings, including the Police station. The Planning Officer commented that the building would contribute to the quality of the area.
- The building itself had existed for longer than 50 years. The whole life cycle carbon assessment looked at the first 50 years of the development and ensured that the building was sustainable. The building would be expected to have a much longer life span.
- The development would provide a total of 29 residential dwellings, contributing towards much needed housing stock in the borough. The development would also provide 19.4% on-site affordable housing. Based on current values and current build costs, there was no further affordable housing that could be delivered. Planning Officers have advised the applicant to prioritise low cost rented units as there was generally less affordable housing in this part of the borough. The Planning Officer concluded that this was an appropriate affordable housing offer in these circumstances.
- Parking would be provided in line with the London Plan, the site was very accessible and was a car free development in line with policies. There would be blue badge parking available.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that they had been liaising with a number of housing associations who were satisfied with the unit mix proposed for Block C.
- Block C was constrained due to its layout of one bed homes which maximised the space within the block. However, this would maximise the level of affordable units.

- There was ongoing discussion regarding refuse collection. Planning Officers had conditioned a service and delivery management plan as part of the suite of conditions.
- In terms of the wind assessment, the proposed development was not tall enough for this as it was four and three storeys in height.
- The solar PV array was changed several times. The array was enlarged due to an additional roof space being found.
- The Applicant had agreed a contribution towards a feasibility study for a cycle route.
- Block C was revised as it previously had an all-brick roof and there were concerns it would be too plain. This was again revised to include a slate roof, fitting in more with the Police station.
- Block C included insulation to a high standard. There was cycle parking on all blocks, which was secure and sheltered.
- A condition would be imposed that required details and samples of all key materials to be agreed prior to commencement of works on site. This would be agreed by the Design Officer and Conservation Officer.
- The Sprinkler system would be in the residential properties at the far end of Mews Lane. They would be based on heat sensors rather than smoke detectors.

There were no objectors speaking against the proposal. The Chair invited the Applicant Team – Chris Boyle – to respond to questions from the Committee. The following was NOTED:

- There was a lot of work involved in making the minimalist design successful. The Applicant stated that the external works were well designed.
- The whole site was within the conservation area, the flat roof would not be flat but angled to allow rainwater to drain away and avoid flooding.
- Located at the front elevation site are defensible spaces for the ground floor threshold. This would help enact privacy from pedestrians, these would not be private inhabited garden areas.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report, The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted and following a vote with 10 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention,

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to an agreement providing for the measures set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards and Sustainability to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended measures and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice-Chair) of the Sub-Committee.
3. That the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than 10/08/2023 within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in his sole discretion allow; and

4. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Summary Lists of Conditions, Informatives and Heads of Terms

Conditions

1. Three years
2. Drawings
3. Materials
4. Boundary treatment and access control
5. Landscaping
6. Lighting
7. Site levels
8. Secure by design accreditation
9. Secure by design certification
10. Unexpected Contamination
11. NRMM
12. Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plan
13. Land Contamination
14. Cycle parking
15. Mobility Scooter
16. Delivery and Servicing Plan
17. Piling Method Statement
18. Strategic Water Main
19. Satellite antenna
20. Restriction to telecommunications apparatus
21. Architect retention
22. Wheelchair accessible dwellings
23. Noise Management Plan
24. Energy Strategy
25. Retrofit
26. Energy Monitoring
27. Overheating
28. Building User Guide

29.Living Roofs and Walls

30.Biodiversity Measures

31.Water Butts

Informatives

1) Co-operation

2) CIL liable

3) Hours of construction

4) Party Wall Act

5) Street Numbering

6) Sprinklers

7) Water pressure

8) Thames Water Groundwater Risk Management Permit

9) Thames Water Underground Asset

10)Asbestos

11)Secure by design

12)Tottenham Lane bus routes

13)Construction Contractors

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

1. Affordable housing provision

- Eight (8) flats for London Affordable Rent
- Early and late stage viability review

2. Section 278 Highway Agreement

- Reinstatement of the redundant crossover on Harold Road, resurfacing of the footway to the perimeter of the site to ensure a high-quality footway, and changes to the on street waiting and loading restrictions as proposed.

3. Sustainable Transport Initiatives

- £4,000 (four thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order- to exclude residents from seeking parking permits
 - Car Club – Five years free membership for all residents and a credit of £100 per year/per unit for the first two years.
 - £10,000 towards a Construction Logistics and Management Plan, which should be submitted 6 months (six months) prior to the commencement of development.
 - Residential Travel Plan should be submitted within 6 months (six months) of first occupation
 - Monitoring of the travel plan initiatives £3,000 (three thousand pounds) for five years
- £15,000 (fifteen thousand pounds) in total

- £100,000 towards sustainable and active travel

4. Carbon Mitigation

- Energy Plan

- Sustainability Review

- Be Seen commitment to uploading energy data

- Estimated carbon offset contribution (and associated obligations) of £29,355 (calculation based on £2,850 per tonne of carbon emissions), plus a 10% management fee.

5. Employment Initiative – participation and financial contribution towards Local Training and Employment Plan

- Provision of a named Employment Initiatives Co-Ordinator;
- Notify the Council of any on-site vacancies;
- 20% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey residents;
- 5% of the on-site workforce to be Haringey resident trainees;
- Provide apprenticeships at one per £3m development cost (max. 10% of total staff)
- Provide a support fee of £1,500 per apprenticeship towards recruitment costs.
- Monitoring Contribution
- 5% of total value of contributions (not including monitoring)
- £500 per non-financial contribution;
- Total monitoring contribution to not exceed £50,000

2.5 In the event that members choose to make a decision contrary to officer's recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

2.6 In the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above not being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.3) above, the planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement failing to secure the provision of on-site affordable housing and meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies H4 and H5, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM 11 and DM 13.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing 1) Section 278 Highway Agreement for the reinstatement of the redundant crossover on Harold Road, resurfacing of the footway to the perimeter of the site to ensure a high quality footway, and changes to the on street waiting and loading restrictions as proposed 2) A contribution towards amendment of the local Traffic Management Order 3) Five years free car club membership and a credit of £100 per year/per unit for the first two years. 4) A contribution towards a Construction Logistics and Management Plan, 5) A contribution towards sustainable and active travel 6) Implementation of a residential travel plan and monitoring fee would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network and give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal is contrary to London Plan policies T1, Development Management DPD Policies DM31, DM32 and DM48

3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to work with the Council's Employment and Skills team and to provide other employment initiatives would fail to support local employment, regeneration and address local unemployment by facilitating training

opportunities for the local population. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP9 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017.

4. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing sufficient energy efficiency measures and financial contribution towards carbon offsetting, would result in an unacceptable level of carbon dioxide emissions. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SI 2 of the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2017 Policy SP4 and Policy DM21 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

2.7 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out in resolution (2.6) above, the Head of Development Management (in consultation with the Chair of Planning Sub-Committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the Planning Application provided that:

- (i) There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and
- (ii) The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and
- (iii) The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution (1) above to secure the obligations specified therein.

9. HGY/2022/0563 - THE GOODS YARD AND THE DEPOT - 36 & 44-52 WHITE HART LANE (AND LAND TO THE REAR) AND 867-869 HIGH ROAD (AND LAND TO THE REAR), N17 8EY

James Dawe, Planning Officer, introduced the report for: Full planning application for (i) the demolition of existing buildings and structures, site clearance and the redevelopment of the site for a residential-led, mixed- use development comprising residential units (C3); flexible commercial, business, community, retail and service uses (Class E); hard and soft landscaping; associated parking; and associated works. (ii) Change of use of No. 52 White Hart Lane from residential (C3) to a flexible retail (Class E) (iii) Change of use of No. 867-869 High Road to residential (C3) use.

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

- The submission had been accompanied by a basement impact assessment that looked at the ground stability of the site and the surroundings. This assessment confirmed that there was appropriate basement and excavation design solutions. These would enable the basement to be excavated and constructed without having impacts on the neighbouring buildings. There would be a survey taken beforehand which would check the condition of the building and monitor conditions during and after construction. If there was any damage, this would be addressed through the party wall agreement.
- Regarding impacts to Brook House primary school, they would benefit from the additional open space. It had always been anticipated that there would be construction on this site, however the long-term impacts were likely to be very positive to the school. There would be some short-term disruption and several conditions and mitigations have been included that would control that as much as possible.
- The wider High Road West planning application covered the whole site allocation and included the Love Lane Estate, The Planning Officer cited they had an obligation to

deliver an area to decant residents from these properties. For this application residents with tenancies at Love Lane Estate that were moving directly into this building would likely pay council rent. However, this would be a housing decision as opposed to a planning decision.

- Planning Officers always considered the quality of the design and ensured that the density delivered was to the best design possible. Planning Officers were satisfied that the quality of provision for the high-density scheme would be acceptable.
- Parking would have to be covered by the parking management plan. The new requirements from the London Plan stated that parking spaces are to be leased not sold. Planning Officers would be looking at how best this could be managed, whilst ensuring they could deliver 10% wheelchair accessible parking. Planning Officers advised they would prioritise the social rented units as part of this plan.
- The start date was set out as five years in the report, but in the detailed conditions the recommendation was 3 years. Previously, Planning Officers had allowed for up to a five-year delay to start working on the development due to uncertainty the recommendation is now for 3 years.
- A majority of the new dwellings would have good levels of internal light provision, this being 50% of the room. The lower levels of the building would have more restricted light because they were more subject to shadow and light reduction due to proximity to other buildings.
- The number of single/dual aspect homes was the same in this report as at the appeal. The inspector did not support anything in terms of the reason for refusal and the quality. Planning Officer stated this level of dual aspect was acceptable.
- The change in appearance that had been made since the scheme was approved on appeal was lightening the entrance core and related to the crown cladding. It was now a light creamy grey rather than a mid-grey. Officers advised that this was a better material as it would provide more contrast between the middle and the entrance of the building. Planning officer advised this would create a more appealing composition.
- This development would not accommodate all residents from the Love Lane Estate
- It is not certain that this housing would be used by the Council to house Love Lane residents. This would depend on a number of factors but if the Council took up this option, the requirement is to provide social rent.
- There would be no proposals to deculvert the River Moselle as part of this proposal.
- To ensure that floor space was not lost and to give businesses opportunities to relocate, there was a quantum of floor space that would be provided. This was secured in detail in the legal agreement and the appeal scheme.

There were no objectors to speak against the proposal. The Chair invited the Applicant Team – James Benyon – to respond to questions from the Committee. NOTED:

- On the Carbery Enterprise Park there was 1125 square metres of light industrial uses. As set out in the report, there was provision of just over 2000 square metres of general class E floor space. As part of these proposals, there was mechanisms to safeguard a minimum of 400 square metres for the reprovision of those uses, alongside support to help businesses relocate. The approach was entirely consistent with what had been agreed for the appeal scheme previously. The only difference being that the Applicant would provide slightly more commercial floor space as part of the scheme by 200 square metres.
- The exact figure for dual aspect within the building was 59.6%. The reason for the number of single aspect units was predominantly driven by the tall buildings. A

majority of single aspect units reside in taller buildings. They were at a higher elevation and therefore benefited from greater levels of daylight.

- A larger proportion of the affordable housing were family size units. The benefit of these larger units was that they were all dual/triple aspect due to their size. These units would sit in low rise blocks but were also in tall buildings. As a result of this, there was a blend of single aspect units across all the tenures.

The Chair asked Robbie McNaugher, Head of Development Management and Enforcement Planning, to sum up the recommendations as set out in the report, the condition was for a three-year permission, not the five-year permission included in the summary of conditions. There was an amended condition as seen in the presentation and the amendments and additional informative in addendum. The Chair moved that the recommendation be granted and following a vote with 10 in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention,

RESOLVED

1. To GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives subject to referral to the Mayor of London for his consideration at Stage 2 and signing of a section 106 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below and a section 278 Legal Agreement providing for the obligations set out in the Heads of Terms below.
2. That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (1) above is to be completed no later than 11th September 2023 or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director shall in her/his sole discretion allow. 3. That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2) above, planning permission is granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.
3. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chair (or in their absence the Vice Chair) of the Sub-Committee. Conditions Summary – (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in Appendix 11 of this report).
 - 1) Time Limit – 5 years
 - 2) Approved Plans and Documents
 - 3) Phases – approval of Phasing Plan (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 4) Minimum amount of Business Floorspace - At least 400sqm of Business floorspace (Use Class E(g) (i) (ii) or (iii)).
 - 5) Accessible Housing – ‘Wheelchair user dwellings’ and ‘Accessible and adaptable dwellings’
 - 6) Commercial Units - Ventilation/Extraction
 - 7) Commercial Units - Café/restaurant Opening Hours - 07.00 to 23.00 (Monday to Saturday) and 08.00 to 23.00 (Sundays and Public Holidays).

- 8) Commercial Units – BREEAM ‘Very Good’(PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 9) Commercial Units – Noise Attenuation
 - 10) Noise Attenuation - Dwellings
 - 11) Depot Block G – Wind Mitigation
 - 12)Detailed Fire Statement – development to be carried out in accordance with.
 - 13) Landscape Details
 - 14) Trees & Planting – 5-year Replacement
 - 15) Temporary Landscaping/Use (Depot part of site)
 - 16) Tree Protection Measures (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 17) Biodiversity enhancement measures
 - 18) External Materials and Details
 - 19) Living roofs
 - 20) Ground Floor Rear Boundary Details – Depot Block D
 - 21) Energy Strategy
 - 22) Overheating (Non-residential)
 - 23) Future overheating (Dwellings)
 - 24) Circular Economy
 - 25) Whole Life Carbon
 - 26) Energy Monitoring
 - 27) PV Arrays
 - 28) Brook House Yard Management Plan
 - 29) Secured by Design
- Planning Sub-Committee Report
- 30)Stage I Written Scheme of Investigation of Archaeology (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
 - 31) Stage II Written Scheme of Investigation of Archaeology
 - 32) Foundation Design – Archaeology (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 33) Water Supply Infrastructure (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 34) Land Contamination – Part 1 (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
 - 35) Land Contamination – Part 2
 - 36) Unexpected Contamination
 - 37) Basement Vehicular Access Control Arrangements
 - 38) Road Safety Audit – White Hart Lane (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)

- 39) Road Safety Audit – Embankment Lane (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 40) Car Parking Design & Management Plan
- 41) Cycle Parking Details (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 42) Delivery and Servicing Plan
- 43) Detailed Construction Logistics Plan (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 44) Public Highway Condition (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 45) Railway Infrastructure Protection Plan
- 46) Demolition/Construction Environmental Management Plans (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 47) Management and Control of Dust (PRE-COMMENCEMENT)
- 3 Business and Community Liaison Construction Group (PRECOMMENCEMENT)
- 50) Telecommunications
- 51) Façade treatment
- 52) Brook House Yard boundary treatment
- 53) District energy network

Informatives Summary – (the full text of Informatives is contained in Appendix 11 to this report).

- 1) Working with the applicant
- 2) Working with the applicant.
- 3) Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 4) Hours of Construction Work.
- 5) Party Wall Act.
- 6) Numbering New Development.
- 7) Asbestos Survey prior to demolition.
- 8) Dust.
- 9) Written Scheme of Investigation – Suitably Qualified Person.
- 10) Deemed Discharge Precluded.
- 11) Composition of Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 12) Disposal of Commercial Waste.
- 13) Piling Method Statement Contact Details.
- 14) Minimum Water Pressure.
- 15) Paid Garden Waste Collection Services.
- 16) Sprinkler Installation.
- 17) Designing out Crime Officer Services.

- 18) Land Ownership.
- 19) Network Rail Asset Protection.
- 20) Site Preparation Works.
- 21) Listed Building Consent – (Nos. 867-869 High Road)
- 22) s106 Agreement and s278 Agreement.

Section 106 Heads of Terms:

Implementation & Business relocation

- 1) Partial implementation – preventing inappropriate ‘mixing and matching’ of the extant Depot scheme and the proposed scheme.
- 2) Business Relocation Strategy – to assist existing business on the Carbery Enterprise Park re-locate within the development or, failing that, within the borough.

Affordable Housing

3) Affordable Housing:

- Minimum of 35.9% by habitable room
- Minimum of 40% by habitable room if sufficient grant available.
- Tenure mix – 60% Intermediate (Shared Ownership) housing & 40% Low Cost Rent housing by habitable room.
- LB Haringey to be offered first right to purchase up to 77 of the Low Cost
- Rented homes at an agreed price per square foot (Index Linked)
- Low Cost Rent homes to be London Affordable Rent – or where LB
- Haringey purchases Low Cost Rent homes, the first 61 at Social Rent and
- any additional homes at London Affordable Rent
- Quality standards & triggers for provision (no more than 25% of Market
- Units occupied until 50% of Affordable Units delivered, no more than 50%
- of Market until 100% of Affordable Units delivered)
- Location of different tenures (by Block).
- Affordable housing residents to have access to the same communal amenity and play space as Market housing (where Blocks have a mix of tenures).

4) Affordability:

- Weekly London Affordable Rent levels to be in accordance with the Mayor
- of London’s Affordable Homes Programme (2016-2023) as follows (all
- Index Linked): 1-bed - £161.71, 2-bed - £171.20, 3-bed - £180.72 and 4-
- bed - £190.23).
- Intermediate homes to be Shared Ownership – sold at the minimum 25%
- share of equity and rental on the unsold equity up to 2.75%.
- Approve plan for marketing Shared Ownership homes to households living or working in: Haringey - with max. annual income of £40,000 (Index Linked) for 1 & 2-bed homes and £60,000 for 3-bed homes – for 3-months prior to and 3-months post completion of each Phase.
- London – with max. annual income of £90,000 (Index Linked) not until after 6 months of completion of each Phase.

- Provided that annual housing costs for each home do not exceed 28% of the above relevant annual gross income levels.

5) Viability Review Mechanism:

- Early Stage Review (if not implemented within 24-months).
- Break Review (if construction suspended for 30-months or more).

Open Space Management

6) Publicly Accessible Open Space Access & Management Plan – ensuring public access and future management & maintenance (in accordance with the Public London Charter) (October 2021).

7) Future Use of ‘Pickford Yard Gardens’ Amenity Space – use by residents of proposed buildings immediately to the south, in the wider NT5 Site Allocation (subject to use of reasonable endeavours).

Transportation

8) Future Connectivity & Access Plan – setting out how the development shall be constructed to allow for potential future pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access across the proposed development and adjoining land.

9) Car-Capping:

- Prohibiting residents (other than Blue Badge holders) from obtaining a
- permit to park in the CPZ
- £4,000 for revising the associated Traffic Management Order.
- 10) Enfield CPZ Contribution – Baseline car parking survey, monitoring and if monitoring shows overspill car parking to be a significant problem, a financial contribution of up to £20,000 towards consultation/implementation of a CPZ.
- 11) Residential & Commercial Travel Plans:
- Appointment of a Travel Plan Coordinator (to also be responsible for monitoring Delivery Servicing Plan).
- Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information, map and timetables to every new household.
- £3,000 for monitoring of Travel Plan initiatives.

12) Car Club:

- Establishment or operation of a Car Club Scheme.
- Minimum of 4 x Car Club spaces (with actual number tbc following discussions with prospective operators).
- 2 years’ free membership for all households and £50 per year credit for the first 2 years.

Employment & Training

13) Local Employment & Training:

- Employment & Skills Plan – including Construction Apprenticeships
- Support Contribution & Skills Contribution (to be calculated in accordance

- with the Planning Obligations SPD).
- Commitment to being part of the borough's Construction Programme.

Carbon Management & Sustainability

14) Future connection to District Energy Network:

- Submission of Energy Plan for approval by LPA
- Connect the whole development (including Station Master's House and Listed Buildings at Nos. 867-869 High Road) to a site-wide energy centre.
- Ensure the scheme is designed to take heat supply from the proposed DEN (including submission of DEN Feasibility Study)
- Design of secondary and (on-site) primary DHN in accordance with LBH
- Generic Specification and approval of details at design, construction and commissioning stages.
- Use all reasonable endeavours to negotiate a supply and connection agreement with the proposed DEN within a 10-year window from the date of a permission.
- Collaborate with the LPA to deliver a future connection point from the site to the south to allow for the onward development of an energy network.
- Carbon offsetting: Payment of an agreed carbon offset amount (residential & non-residential) plus 10% management fee on commencement;

Telecommunications

16) Ultrafast broadband infrastructure and connections to be provided.

Construction

17) Commitment to Considerate Constructors Scheme.

Monitoring

18) Monitoring costs – based on 5% of the financial contribution total & £500 per non-financial contribution.

Section 278 Highways Agreement Heads of Terms:

1) Works to tie in with the High Road and White Hart Lane.

3.1 In the event that members choose to make a resolution contrary to officers' recommendation, members will need to state their reasons.

3.2 That, in the absence of the agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above being completed within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, the planning application be refused for the following reasons:

i. In the absence of a legal agreement preventing the partial implementation of the Goods Yard extant consent (HGY/2018/0187) or the partial implementation of the Depot extant consent (HGY/2019/2929), the partial implementation of the proposed scheme and either of these extant schemes could result in an unacceptable form of development, contrary to good planning and Tottenham Area Action Plan Policies AAP1 and NT5.

ii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of an approved Business Relocation Strategy, the proposed scheme would result in the unacceptable loss

of industrial land, contrary to London Plan Policy E4, Strategic Policies SP8 and SP9 and DMD Policy DM40.

iii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing (1) the proposed provision of on-site affordable housing; (2) Early Stage and Development Break Viability Reviews; (3) and the first right of the Council to purchase up to 61 of the proposed Low Cost Rent homes, the proposed scheme would fail to foster a mixed and balanced neighbourhood where people choose to live, and which meet the housing aspirations of Haringey's residents or assist in estate regeneration. As such, the proposals would be contrary to London Plan Policies H4 and H8, Strategic Policy SP2, and DM DPD Policies DM 11 and DM 13, Policy TH12 and Policy NT5.

iv. In the absence of the legal agreement securing an Open Space Management and Access Plan and obligations relating to the future use of and access to the proposed Pickford Yard Gardens, the proposed scheme would fail to secure well-maintained open space and fail to safeguard the comprehensive development of Site Allocation NT5. As such, the proposals would be contrary to Strategic Policy SP12, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policies AAP1, AAP11 and NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM20.

v. In the absence of a legal agreement securing financial contributions towards social infrastructure provision (community space, library and publicly accessible open space), the proposed scheme would (1) fail to meet the requirements for a Fast Track application as set out in London Plan Policy H5 and would require a Financial Viability Appraisal to justify the proposed amount and type of affordable housing; and (2) fail to make a proportionate contribution towards the costs of providing the infrastructure needed to support the comprehensive development of Site Allocation NT5. As such, the proposals are contrary to London Plan Policy DF1, Strategic Policies SP16 and SP17, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policies AAP1, AAP11 and NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM48.

vi. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the public benefits of the scheme (including affordable housing, potential contribution to Love Lane Estate regeneration, financial contributions towards social infrastructure provision, reduction to carbon dioxide emissions and local employment and training), the proposed scheme would lead to 'less than substantial harm' to heritage assets that would not be outweighed by public benefits, contrary to NPPF paragraph 196, London Plan Policy HC1, Strategic Policy SP12, Policy AAP5, AAP Site Allocation NT5 and DPD Policy DM9.

vii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing (1) a Future Connectivity & Access Plan; (2) Car Capped Agreement and financial contributions to amend the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) to change existing on-street car parking control measures; (3) a financial contribution towards a survey, consultation and potential implementation of an Enfield CPZ; (4) Travel Plans and financial contributions toward travel plan monitoring; and (5) Car Club provision, the proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the safe operation of the highway network, give rise to overspill parking impacts and unsustainable modes of travel. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies T1, T2, T6, T6.1 and T7, Spatial Policy SP7, Tottenham Area Action Plan Policy NT5 and DM DPD Policy DM31.

viii. In the absence of a legal agreement securing the implementation of (1) any necessary temporary heating solutions; (2) an energy strategy, including connection to a DEN; and (3) carbon offset payments, the proposals would fail to mitigate the impacts of climate change. As such, the proposal would be unsustainable and contrary to London Plan

Policies SI2 and SI3 and Strategic Policy SP4, and DM DPD Policies DM 21, DM22 and SA48.

ix. In the absence of a legal agreement securing an Employment and Skills Plan the proposals would fail to ensure that Haringey residents benefit from growth and regeneration. As such, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy E11 and DMD Policy DM40.

x. In the absence of a legal agreement requiring broadband connectivity designed into the development, the proposed scheme would fail to provide.

sufficient digital connectivity for future residents and businesses, contrary to London Plan Policy SI6 and DMD Policy DM54.

3.3 In the event that the Planning Application is refused for the reasons set out above, the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director (in consultation with the Chair of Planning sub-committee) is hereby authorised to approve any further application for planning permission which duplicates the

Planning Application provided that:

i. There has not been any material change in circumstances in the relevant planning considerations, and

ii. The further application for planning permission is submitted to and approved by the Assistant Director within a period of not more than 12 months from the date of the said refusal, and

iii. The relevant parties shall have previously entered into the agreement contemplated in resolution 2.1 above to secure the obligations specified therein.

10. NEW ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

There were no new items of urgent business.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the date of the next meeting was 11th September 2023.

CHAIR: Councillor Barbara Blake

Signed by ChairCouncillor Barbara Blake.....

Date09/08/2023.....