

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

Councillors: *Peacock (Chair), *Beacham, *Demirci, *Dodds (Deputy Chair), *Hare, Mallett, Patel, *Weber and *Wilson

* Denotes Members present

Also Present: Councillors Allison, Amin, Diakides, Lister, Oakes, Thompson and Vanier

MINUTE NO.	SUBJECT/DECISION	ACTION BY
PC299.	CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS The Chair welcomed members of the public to the Special meeting of the Planning Committee and noted that some members of the members of the public would be listening to the proceedings in the Reception Hall from the loud speakers and asked speakers to confirm who they were and who they represented. The Chair referred to the tragic death of Baby P and requested that speakers should not bring this into their representations to the Committee. The Chair referred to the death of Councillor Fred Knight a former Member of the Committee who passed away on the 13 November 2008. All present stood in a minute's silence as a mark of respect.	
PC300.	POINTS OF ORDER By permission of the Chair, Cllr Oakes raised two points of order. First, that the Chair should stand down as having a predisposition interest in respect of applications concerning the Wards Corner site to disqualify on the Grainger applications as well as the alternative Coalition application. Secondly, that Cllr Stanton should also stand down as his partner Zena Brabazon had led the project for the redevelopment of Wards Corner. The Council's Planning Solicitor advised the Committee that the first point of order had already been covered in correspondence. The Head of Legal Services had reviewed representations in the light of published guidance from the Standards Board for England and taken the firm view that the assertions were far too frail to disqualify Cllr Peacock from participating in decisions on the Grainger applications. On the second point of order the Solicitor stated that Zena Brabazon had not been involved with the project for over three years and advised the Committee against the point of order. Cllr Diakides had laid a paper round the table for Committee Members only. The Chair ruled that this was out of order.	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

<p>PC301.</p>	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mallett for whom Cllr Adamou was substituting and from Cllr Patel for whom Cllr Stanton was substituting.</p>	
<p>PC302.</p>	<p>URGENT BUSINESS</p> <p>There were no items of urgent business.</p>	
<p>PC303.</p>	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Cllr Beacham declared a personal interest in agenda item 5, Wards Corner site, N15. Cllr Beacham advised that he was employed by London Underground Limited.</p>	
<p>PC304.</p>	<p>WARDS CORNER SITE, HIGH ROAD N15</p> <p>The Planning Officer advised the Committee that in respect of the application before them there were some amendments to the drawings as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing number P(0222) was not submitted as part of the application and therefore removed from part of the decision. • Drawing number 100A should be 100B and, • Drawing number 101A should be 101B. <p>The planning authority had also received a number of objections which had been received after the planning application report had been written:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A letter from David Lammy MP dated 13 November 2008, explained his position and welcomed development on the site which would benefit everyone in the future. 2. Seven emails of objections were received on 13 November 2008. 3. An email from David Schmidt dated 14 November 2008. An email objection from Sue Penny, Justin Hinchcliff, representative of Tottenham Conservatives, Philip Roberts objections, two further email were received, three letters were also received. 4. A further 43 letters of objections were received on 17 November 2008, consisting of standard letters signed by local people. 5. A number of emails were also received on 17 November 2008. 6. A petition with approximately 20 pages, each page had 24 signatures, making an approximate total of 480 signatures. 7. Nineteen typed letters, with no headers, footers or 	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

signatures were also received.

8. A total of 128 standard letter format, signed by individual people objecting to the application was received.

The Officer presented the report and informed the Committee that the Wards Corner site comprised 227 - 259 High Road, 709 – 723 Seven Sisters Road, 1a -11 West Green Road and 8 – 30 Suffield Road. The site contained the former Wards Corner department store and was situated above the Seven Sisters Victoria Line Underground Station and tunnels.

The front of the site fell within the Page Green/Seven Sisters Conservation Area. The Tottenham High Road historic corridor policy identified Wards Corner as a key regeneration site. The site also fell within the Bridge NDC boundary and within Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief dated January 2004.

The proposed development comprised retail on the ground floor of the Seven Sisters, High Road and West Green Road frontages. A variety of unit sizes were proposed amounting in total 3700 square metres of floor space with access via a secure service road with gated entrance onto Suffield Road. A café-bar/restaurant was proposed at first floor level on the High Road frontage. The residential development comprised 197 new flats at first floor level and above, and 18 family units with direct access onto Suffield Road situated around a communal garden square at first floor level, accessed via a main foyer with access from the High Road frontage. The proposed development would include improvements to the public realm on the High Road and other frontages including the provision of public art. The proposal included the provision of 44 car parking spaces, including 3 disabled spaces in the basement car park.

The Planning Officer further advised that in January 2004 the council adopted a development brief for Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Station. The land covered by the brief included Apex House, however the brief focused on the Wards Corner site which was the application thought to be most likely to come forward for development and incorporated the following aspects:

- The regeneration of the public realm,
- Provision of a safe, attractive and convenient public square and transport interchange,
- Economic regeneration through a transformation of the quality and range of shops and other services on offer.
- Housing regeneration through the creation of nearly 200 new homes.
- Physical regeneration, through the creation of a landmark development, in terms of design and construction.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

- A reduction in crime and the perception of crime.
- The creation of employment and skills based training.

The planning officer went on to explain that the design whilst being modern, was intended to reflect the traditional elements of the existing buildings in the High Road by using appropriate proportion and sub division of the facades of the proposed new buildings and traditional facing materials including brick. The design was based upon a study of Tottenham High Road. The High Road had a number design characteristics including individual terraces, vertical rhythms of house design, shop fronts and windows, varying window framing and brick being the predominant material.

West Green Road and Tottenham High Road frontages were identified as primary frontages in the UDP. Seven Sisters Road was within a secondary frontage. The size and layout of the shops had been designed so that the large units were on the High Road frontage and the smaller units were on the West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road frontages where it was considered that they better matched the type of shops and trading at those locations. The proposed development would provide 3,792 metre squared of new retain floor space including the re-provision of the market subject to conditions.

The application site was within a defined town centre and had excellent public transport links by train, underground and bus. The proposed residential development was provided in the form of duplexes and flats. The London Plan proposed a residential density of between 650 and 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare for this type of site. The proposed development density was 795 habitable rooms per hectare.

The Planning Officer further advised that the GLA toolkit endorsed the view that the scheme was not viable with on site affordable housing. The Council as Housing Authority had given assurances regarding the provision of off site affordable housing to complement the proposed development and to fulfil the objectives of comprehensive development of the Wards Corner brief. The proposed mix of dwellings to be provided was 5 studios (2.5%), 48 x 1 bed (24%), 107 x 2 bed (54.5%) and 37 x 3 bed (19%). Due to the location and the commercial nature of the proposed development it was not considered a suitable location for large family units. It was proposed that all the homes provided would be of a Lifetime Homes Standard with the exception of the 19 Duplex within Suffield Road and 4 flats and two other duplex units which could be adapted in the future to include a small entry-level living room and ground floor water closet with shower which would enable the lifetime homes criteria to be fulfilled. In accordance with the Council's SPG policy 10% of the total number of dwellings to be provided, would be wheelchair

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

accessible or easily adapted for wheelchair use.

It was proposed that a competition be held and the chosen artwork be erected at the front of the site on the High Road frontage including the design of a frieze on the proposed corner building totalling £100,000.

Proposed works to the public realm included enhancement to transport / station entrance improvements be provided and that the applications enter into a Section 278 of the Highways Act Agreement in connection with the works. A separate agreement would be reached with the relevant statutory parties and owners in order to carry out the works.

There was provision of 1538 square metres of amenity within the central courtyard at first floor level overlooked by the surrounding residential units. The amenity space was laid out as a landscaped area on two levels and included ornamental trees and good cover planting, lawn areas, seating and timber decking ramped access to lower gardens, pouring and lighting to the main footways. The area also incorporated a children's play space.

Included within the development was thermal fabric performance improvements over building regulations requirements and energy efficient lighting to reduce Co2 emissions by 8% for the proposed development. In order to provide renewable energy the use of a dual bio-fuel boiler was proposed and would achieve a 10.5% reduction in Co2 emissions from the use of renewable energy. The proposed development was designed to achieve level 3 of the code of sustainable homes.

The site was well located in relation to public transport and therefore would reduce the need for car-use and where other sustainable travel modes could be encouraged.

The development proposed 44 car parking spaces in the basement and would compensate for the loss of the existing 48 car parking spaces on the site and would limit the car parking impact upon nearby roads. Future occupiers of the residential development with the exception of the 12 houses to be situated in Suffield Road would not be issued with car parking permits for the CPZ. The applicants had agreed to submit two travel plans one for residential and one for commercial use.

A day light and sunlight assessment in relation to the proposed development based upon Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines had been submitted by the applicants. The assessment concluded that retained levels of daylight and sunlight were good and in compliance with the BRE guidelines.

The indoor market was re-provided as shown on the proposed

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

development drawings subject to the conditions shown in the report.

The Committee were further advised of the other elements of the proposed scheme:

- Implementation of travel plans for key land uses.
- Provision of a central energy centre and reduction of Co2 emission of up to 20%.
- Achievement of at least level 3 under the Code for Sustainable Homes. Establishment of a management company that would have responsibility for the ongoing site management and security.
- Establishment of a CCTV system and central monitoring suite.
- Procurement of goods and services from local businesses and recruitment of local people.
- Construction training and local labour agreement.
- Provision of maintenance of Podium Garden and Play space.
- No entitlement for occupiers to residents parking permits (except for 12 permits for the houses in Suffield Road).

The Committee questioned officers on the proposed development in relation to the following issues:

1. In relation to affordable housing what guarantees were given to provide social housing elsewhere and why not on the proposed site.
2. In terms of construction delivery, goods would travel by freight. Had other delivery options been explored to reduce the amount of additional traffic which would be caused in the area.
3. An explanation was requested in relation to the term landmark development, where the term came from and how it was possible to judge that the scheme would be a landmark development.
4. English Heritage had considered that the building would not contribute to the Conservation Area and this would indicate that the building would not be considered as a landmark development.

The Committee was advised in response to the questions raised above that:

1. The proposed development was a difficult site with considerable construction costs. The normal practice would be to use the GLA toolkit to demonstrate whether there was sufficient capacity to allow affordable housing on the site. In this case it had been verified by the valuation office at the GLA that it was not possible to provide

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

affordable housing on the site. The viability was to provide 50% affordable housing that this could not be provided on this site and to also bring forward a scheme. The amount of affordable housing to be provided for this site was yet to be determined. The scheme proposed was a large difficult scheme in terms of the location, creation of the public realm, within an area of low land value made this scheme complicated and expensive.

2. The transportation officer informed the Committee that possible delivery options by road were not explored however, the applicants were asked to utilise surface rail and it was possible that some deliveries could be transported by small businesses using transit vans.
3. The Committee was informed that another term used in stead of landmark was gateway and that they were presentational but significant terms that stood out. It meant that the development would become a place that focused the community.
4. The planning officer stated in comparison to the current state of the buildings, the report made recommendations for the proposed scheme. The development would be a key southern entrance to Haringey, the scheme was larger, more complex, developed more floor space and regeneration. Comparison should be made to the design of the art centre and the large public square. The proposed scheme would provide a much stronger physical presence than what was there currently.

The Committee allowed four interested parties to address the Committee and outline their objections, who represented the Wards Corner Community Coalition, Tottenham Traders Association, local small business owners and local residents. The Committee was informed that the proposed development was unpopular and would not be considered a landmark development. It would have extremely negative impacts on existing local businesses, homes, social amenity and community cohesion. Objections related specifically to loss of longstanding, diverse and viable businesses and jobs; detriment to community cohesion in Tottenham through targeted harm to ethnic minority communities, poor quality, monumental design out of keeping with the location, destruction of a well regarded heritage building.

The Committee was further informed that over the past years the Council had neglected the site but despite this the traders had survived. The applicants had held a meeting with the Market Traders to explain the revised plan but no other consultation had taken place. It was felt that the planning application was being rushed for other ulterior reasons.

The scheme did not meet the principles of key national or local policies, particularly the UDP. The planning report did not weigh

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

up the Section 106 planning gains. It was not possible to relocate and preserve the entire market as required by the London Mayor. The proposed application was deeply flawed and potentially very damaging:

- Poor or non-existent consultation
- Substantial local opposition
- Opposition from nation organisations

It was considered that two public authorities had no regard for social housing, family homes, a locally listed building lost forever and a thriving community destroyed. An alternative could be considered, a new scheme which incorporated part restoration and part new build so that existing businesses could remain on the site. The Prince's Regeneration Trust were prepared to broker a fresh approach in cooperation with all parties involved. The Wards Corner site was important for the local community and represented mixed nationalities in one centre. A collaboration of all interested parties of Wards Corner was what was required.

Members questioned the objectors on their proposal to part restore and part renew the site and how it would work. There were further enquiries in respect of how much consultation had taken place with local traders/residents, what would be the effects on the market while the area was developed, was it viable that 60% of the traders could return to the market and whether any of the traders lived on the site. The objectors responded that they would like to see the Victorian/Edwardian frontage kept and restored as they would have to move which created uncertainty. The steel trained building on the edge of the site should be retained. The Princes Regeneration Trust felt it could be brought back to it's former glory and that these buildings could be saved. In response to the subsequent questions raised Members were informed that traders did live on the site and no provision was made for them during the interim development period. No arrangements had been made for consultation meetings, groups or letters from the Council.

A supporter of the development addressed the Committee and stated that the Words Corner Coalition was not representative of the whole community. The proposed development would create a range of shops and cafes which would benefit the whole community. The current shopping options did not meet the needs of the community however, it was hoped that the market would be retained for current traders.

A local resident addressed the Committee in support of the application that the current site was a landmark for decay as it was falling down. The proposed plan would bring investment to the wider community, safety and jobs for everyone to enjoy. The vocal and negative element previously made do not speak for

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

everyone. The regeneration the development would bring would spread along Tottenham High Road for the benefit of the whole community.

A representative of The Bridge New Deal for Communities (NDC) and a local resident for 26 years in Tottenham wanted to leave a lasting legacy for local people. There had been several attempts to regenerate Wards Corner and it was their goal to see the site transformed for the wellbeing/benefits of local people. Contrary to press reports the NDC had put in place proposals to support the market traders during the temporary period of site development. The following consultations had taken place:

- The GLA endorsed the development
- The Police had been consulted by the architects
- The plan included crime reduction measures

The majority of residents in the NDC area were in support of the application and the proposals were long overdue. Residents were tired of seeing the same building and wanted to look forward to a decent standard of living. The committee was asked if the building was considered to be so important why had it not achieved listed status and why should it hold back regeneration in the area.

The Committee queried whether the market traders had been involved in the proposals for the site and in response was informed that Consultation had began in 2003, and continued throughout 2003, 2005 and 2007. A public consultation was held in July 2005, where newsletters were despatched to 10,000 homes. An exhibitions was held in July 2007 attended by 350 residents and local businesses. The consultations had been on-going and stakeholder meetings had taken place.

Cllr Lister addressed the Committee and raised two issues:

1. The link between this development and Apex House, paragraph 6.7 in the report related to affordable housing which would need to be taken into account to comply with the London Plan and local development framework. The two sites would need to be connected.
2. The two proposals were in conflict and if the proposed application were agreed where would the other stand and would it be considered?

Cllr Vanier addressed the Committee and advised that everyone wanted to see some improvement on the site. It was not an option for the site to remain in its current condition, however it was felt that the current proposal should not be granted simply because residents did not want the proposed scheme. Opposition to this proposal had not been seen in Tottenham since

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

the 1970s. There needed to be real discussion so interested parties could examine both proposals. If the application for Wards Corner was granted it would impact on the Apex House application. The community needed to be involved and in a meaningful way.

Cllr Diakides addressed the Committee and objected to the proposals on the following grounds:

1. The changing circumstances and errors had turned out a proposal that failed to meet the planning brief objectives and what's more blighted the area, jobs would be lost along with valuable local facilities and upset the local residents.
2. The local traders reflected the rich cosmopolitan mixture of the local community and their businesses responded to the special needs of those communities. These would not be accommodated within the proposed development.
3. The plan did not meet the UDP prescription of 50% affordable housing.
4. The proposal did not meet the basic Section 106 expectation for the introduction of 200 new housing units i.e. demand for education, health, environment and other services.
5. The proposal was not a landmark development but mediocre, developer's minimalism.

The Committee was asked to reject the proposal and therefore, open the way for a proper regeneration plan, a proposal which was considered more popular.

The Committee received a representation from the Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee (TCAAC) who explained that the TCAAC had advised the Council to reject the application for planning permission. The Council's policy on regeneration should be heritage lead. Haringey's historical buildings were historical local landmarks and created a sense of place and stability. It was hoped that Wards Corner could be refurbished/restored. The Wards Corner Brief asked for a gateway but also to retain the locally listed buildings as they contributed to the Conservation Area.

The representative of the TCAAC was asked by Members whether it was still the intention to get the buildings listed by English Heritage. In response the Committee was advised that the buildings were locally listed, had architectural merit and would have more presence if restored. The current buildings were considered to be special, distinctive, unique and there was nothing else like them in Tottenham.

Cllr Allison informed the Committee that there were so many

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

reasons to oppose the application:

1. The development brief required a scheme proposing a high quality landmark for the Tottenham area. The current application was not attractive nor a land mark building. Regeneration of an area did not mean demolish a landmark already in existence.
2. The proposed scheme provided for flats which were not designed for the existing community. No affordable housing was to be provided on the site therefore segregated the community.
3. The jobs of the market traders were not just jobs but considered to be their way of life.

Cllr Allison further requested the planners to go back to the drawing board.

Cllr Oakes advised the Committee that they were dealing with two applications for one site. The two applications were dependent upon what decision the Committee made in respect of the application before them. The plans should come back to the Committee after consultation with the Wards Corner community. The development brief stated that the department store had architectural merit. The proposed scheme sought to demolish it. The buildings form part of the communities heritage, sense of place and the fact that it had survived. The building deserved to be preserved and should be the focal part of a new scheme.

The applicants addressed the Committee and interested parties in response and stated that the proposed scheme would facilitate change, Wards Corner was a strategic site located near a tube station and twelve bus routes. The diverse community made Tottenham a unique community. Tottenham Green had seen an increase in crime and this was supported by the Police. An independent ICM poll stated that 80% of local people felt substantial investment was a good idea, 65% said they felt unsafe around Wards Corner at night. There was a desire for change, the site was complex, particularly because of increased costs and multiple ownership. In 2007, and after 25 designs, it was considered that the proposed scheme was possible and viable. The applicants had invested considerably in a consultation process:

- Four extra consultation meetings
- 31, different leaflets had been distributed
- Website press articles
- Design panels
- Three development forums and
- Other methods of consultation

The development brief had been significantly altered to include

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

accommodation for the market and to develop quality convenient shopping. Agreement had been reached to compensate market traders to temporarily leave the site. It also included the provision of a central arts centre. The proposal would provide much needed clarity of the site.

The applicants explained the features and design of this large site, considered to be an ambitious regeneration brief. There were three key elements to the development; shops, restaurants, cafes, homes and public spaces. There was tremendous support for improvement on the High Road frontage which would make the area easier and more enjoyable to move through. There would be public involvement in the competition and new shop fronts would line the street frontages, including a wider range of shop sizes to provide modern space for the market traders to survive. The main entrances to the flats faced onto the square. There would be a concierge service providing security to the homes. The homes were arranged in ten blocks around the square. CABA were especially complimentary about the accommodation to be provided. Each of the four streets had a different character. The development was broken down into four buildings of different heights and the flats would be connected to the shops below. CABA and the GLA had commented favourably on the approach for this development. The corner building would provide a prominent landmark clearly visible to all.

The applicants further advised that the site was in decline for many years and they had invested capital to find a solution, taking into account feedback received during the consultations. The results of the independent reports concluded that the development would provide safe, secure, sustainable homes for residents and visitors to the area.

Members again questioned the applicants on why they had taken the approach not to provide affordable housing on the site. Apex House was to provide 50% affordable housing and when was this to be proposed. In response the applicants stated that the proposal contained no affordable housing, however affordable housing was linked to housing in the wider area. The development brief called for a transformation and work on this proposal had taken place over the last two years. Four percent of respondents to the ICM poll had identified Wards Corner as a location of high importance. There were key policies for this site; regeneration for the area, appropriate housing density, housing targets, homes with gardens which don't exist at present. The proposed development took into account money that needed to be ploughed into the public realm. Those policy aims were considered to be more important than affordable housing on the site. It had been negotiated that affordable housing would be considered on an alternative site and the Local Authority were committed to affordable housing in the local area. The Planning

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

Authority was clear there were other sites available to deliver all the affordable housing for this site.

The Committee enquired about the criticism received in respect of the compensation for market traders to move out temporarily and that the proposed rents should be for local small business and not national retailers. The applicant replied that the rents had been outlined and conditioned in the proposed Section 106 Legal Agreement, that open market rents would be affordable. Compensation had been calculated on the basis of leases and not licences and on the basis that market traders had operated for 14 years. The current licences included a paragraph that the site would be open to development.

The Committee viewed the plans at 9:58pm.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the transportation of goods onto the site, the viability of the market traders who could be split up, that there was no guarantee that the rents would be at a level affordable for market traders. In response the applicants advised that the market traders had previously moved from the site and returned. The traders would be treated as leaseholders in terms of compensation, this condition would be set out in the Section 106 notice and considered to be fair and strong. Transport, access and the servicing was considered to be much improved as there would be access, egress and turning for parking. Many schemes of this size in London functioned with the arrangements that were proposed. A Member enquired whether the applicants had looked at the feasibility of retaining the buildings and in response was informed that the buildings were not of any national note however, this was based on judgement. The report outlined the aspects that could be argued for retention, balanced against the cost of maintenance and came to a conclusion. The height of the proposed scheme was required in relation to the width of the High Road.

Cllr Dodds moved a motion to move to the vote. The Chair put the motion to the Committee. On a vote there being 5 in favour and 4 against the Committee agreed to move to the vote.

The Chair moved a motion to agree the recommendations in the report and the conditions outlined on pages 47 - 55. On a vote there being 5 in favour and 4 against the motion was carried.

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to condition and a Section 106 Legal Agreement subject to direction of the GLA.

INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF:

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

HGY/2008/0303
FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 17/11/2008

Location: Wards Corner Site, High Road N15

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of mixed use development comprising Class C3 residential and Class A1/A2/A3/A4 with access parking and associated landscaping and public realm improvements.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement subject to direction of the GLA

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement subject to direction of the GLA

Drawing No's: P (00) 00, P (00) 01C, P (00) 02, P (00) 03, P (00) 04, P (00) 05, P (00) 06, P (00) 07A, P (00) 08A, P (00) 09, P (00) 10, P (00) 20, P (00) 21, P (00) 100B, P (00) 101A, P (00) 102A, P (00) 103A, P (00) 110A, P (00) 111A.

Design and Access Statement: Wards Corner Seven Sisters Design and Access Statement and accompanying statements Pollard Thames Edwards Architects January 2008.

Conditions:

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

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

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

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

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development of the relevant part shall be commenced until precise details of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority.

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

4. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

Local Planning Authority before any of the relevant part of the development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.

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

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

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

6. That a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

7. In order to ensure that the shops are accessible to people with disabilities and people pushing double buggies, the door must have a minimum width of 900mm, and a maximum threshold of 25mm.

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

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

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

9. The development hereby authorised shall comply with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1, 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and comply with the aims and objectives of the

Police requirement of 'Secured By Design' and 'Designing Out Crime' principles.

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

10. That the accommodation for car parking and/or loading and unloading facilities be specifically submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority before the occupation of the building and commencement of the use; that accommodation to be permanently

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

retained for the accommodation of vehicles of the occupiers, users of, or persons calling at the premises and shall not be used for any other purposes.

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

11. That details of and on site parking management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the use of the basement car parking area. Such agreed plan to be implemented and permanently maintained in operation to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

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

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

13. The proposed development shall have a central dish/aerial system for receiving all broadcasts for all the residential units created, details of such a scheme shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the property and the approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to protect the visual amenities of the neighbourhood.

14. The authorised development shall not begin until drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

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

15. That details of a management plan for the management and maintenance of the first floor gardens play space and roof gardens shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the residential units such agreed details to be implemented and maintained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure that a satisfactory standard of amenity space and play facilities is maintained for the future occupiers of the proposed development.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

16. That details of a site specific Environmental Management Plan as referred to in the Air Quality Assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such agreed plan shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local planning Authority during the period of construction.

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

17. That all the residential units with the proposed development with the exception of these referred to directly in the Design and Access Statement as not being able to be compliant shall be designed to Lifetime Homes Standard.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets the Councils Standards in relation to the provision of Lifetime Homes.

18. That at least 20 flats within the proposed development shall be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair use.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development meets the Council's Standards for the provision of wheelchair accessible dwellings.

19. That details of the specification of the glazing to be used in connection with the proposed development in relation to reducing noise levels within the residential units shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works. Such agreed specification to be implemented and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

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

20. That the service road ventilation plant noise emissions shall be in accordance with the limiting sound pressure level referred to in the Noise and Vibration Assessment.

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

21. That the proposed development shall provide service covered storage for 197 cycle racks for the residential units and 38 cycle racks for the commercial units, a total of 235 cycle racks to be provided.

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

22. That the commercial uses shall not be operational before 0700 or after 0100 hours on any day.

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

23. That the applicant shall submit 2 travel plans, one for the residential one for the commercial use, the details of which shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the proposed development. Such agreed details shall be implemented and permanently maintained to the satisfaction of the

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure sustainable travel and minimise the impact of the proposed development in the adjoining road network.

24. That details of the routeing of the associated construction traffic and networks of delivering of goods to the retail/commercial uses of the proposed development be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such agreed details shall be implemented and where appropriate permanently maintained to the satisfaction of the local Planning Authority

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposed development does not disrupt the movement of vehicles and pedestrians doing the adjoining roads and footways.

25. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall provide details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority of measures to reduce CO2 emissions from renewable energy technologies by 10.5%.

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

26. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall provide full details, to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, of the biofuel boiler type, air quality impact, fuel supply and carbon intensity.

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

27. The applicant shall implement no more than one energy centre and heat network, connecting all uses and incorporating a CHP as the lead boiler sized to minimise carbon dioxide emissions and a biofuel-only boiler as the primary top-up boiler.

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

28. The applicant shall implement energy efficiency measures for the residential units to reduce CO2 emissions by at least 8% beyond the Target Emissions Rate in line with the Fulcrum Consulting energy strategy dated 04/09/2008.

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

29. Notwithstanding the information shown on the approved drawings the detailed design and materials of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of that part of the development:

- Replacement bus stops
- Alterations to Seven Sisters underground station entrances (above ground)
- Footway alterations and improvements to High Road, West Green Road, Suffield Road and Seven Sisters Road and Seven Sisters Road.

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development results in improvements to the safety and safe access of pedestrians on the public highway and users of public transport.

30. That 15 months from the practical completion of the development, the applicant shall submit to the Local Planning Authority a statement confirming the amount of biofuel used by the development in the preceding year. Such a statement shall be submitted annually until the expiration of 5 years.

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

31. Energy models for the commercial units based on NCM compliant methods shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved prior to commencement of works to those units.

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

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

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

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

INFORMATIVE: The carbon intensity of the biofuel should be confirmed against the Government's Renewable Transport Fuel Obligation carbon and sustainability methodology for biofuels.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development of the site for a mixed use development comprising retail shops and restaurants and residential accommodation with servicing parking and amenity space has been assessed against and found on balance to comply with all the relevant Governmental, National, Regional, Sub Regional and Local Planning Policies which within considered constraints support the regeneration of the Wards

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

	<p>Corner site.</p> <p>Section 106: Yes</p>	
<p>PC305.</p>	<p>WARDS CORNER SITE, HIGH ROAD N15 ~ CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT</p> <p>The application for Conservation Area Consent was for the demolition of 18 buildings which fell within the boundary of Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area within the application site. The remainder of the buildings on the application site fell outside the Conservation Area boundary and do not therefore require consent to be demolished. There were no listed buildings on the site.</p> <p>The Planning Officer informed the Committee that it had been demonstrated that the cost of repair and maintenance and the loss of value associated with the retention would be prohibitive in relation to the existing buildings. It was further demonstrated that the alternatives to demolition in the form of retention of the Wards Corner building, retention, replication or redesign of the façade would not be viable.</p> <p>The proposed development was considered to contribute to the character of Seven Sisters Conservation Area and fulfil the vision of the planning brief, which would result in a range of positive benefits to the community and kick start the regeneration of the locality.</p> <p>It was considered that the decision in this case as to whether or not to allow Conservation Area Consent should be made in the context of the significant community benefits which would result from the proposed redevelopment of the application site.</p> <p>The Committee was asked to consider Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of 227 -259 High Road. 1a, 1b and 1 West Green Road N15.</p> <p>The Chair moved a motion to grant Conservation Area Consent for the above proposal subject to conditions and a Section 106 Legal Agreement subject to Direction of the GLA.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>On a vote there being five in favour and four against Conservation Area Consent was granted. The Committee agreed to grant Conservation Area Consent as planning permission for the application outlined in PC302 above was granted.</p> <p>INFORMATION RELATING TO APPLICATION REF: HGY/2008/0322</p>	

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

FOR PLANNING COMMITTEE DATED 17/11/2008

Location: Wards Corner Site, High Road N15

Proposal: Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing buildings and erection of mixed use development comprising Class C3 residential and Class A1/A2/A3/A4 with access parking and associated landscaping and public realm improvements.

Recommendation: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement subject to direction of the GLA

Decision: Grant subject to conditions and Legal Agreement subject to direction of the GLA

Drawing No's: P (00) 00, P (00) 01C, P (00) 02, P (00) 03, P (00) 04, P (00) 05, P (00) 06, P (00) 07A, P (00) 08A, P (00) 09, P (00) 10, P (00) 20, P (00) 21, P (00) 100B, P (00) 101A, P (00) 102A, P (00) 103A, P (00) 110A, P (00) 111A.

Design and Access Statement: Wards Corner Seven Sisters Design and Access Statement and accompanying statements Pollard Thames Edwards Architects January 2008.

Conservation Area Audit and Statement Addendum Report 2008

Former Wards Corner Store - 227 -229 Tottenham High Road - appraisal of options for retention or redevelopment

Public Artwork Outline Brief Dated 20th June 2008.

Conditions:

1. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides.
Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development of the site for a mixed use development comprising retail shops and restaurants and residential accommodation with servicing parking and amenity space has been assessed against and found on balance to comply with all the relevant Governmental, National, Regional, Sub Regional and Local Planning Policies which within considered constraints support the regeneration of the Wards Corner site.

Section 106: Yes

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
MONDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2008**

PC306.	DATE OF NEXT MEETING Monday 8 December 2008 The meeting concluded at 10:45pm	
---------------	---	--

COUNCILLOR SHEILA PEACOCK
Chair