

# **MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY, 14 JUNE 2022, 7PM – 8.30PM**

**COUNCILLORS:** Barbara Blake (chair), Rice (vice-chair), Bevan, Bartlett, Buxton, Cawley-Harrison, Dunstall, Ovat, Say, White.

**Also present:** Councillor Carlin (Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters, and Planning), Rob Krzyszowski (Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability), Robbie McNaugher (Head of Development Management, and Enforcement), Bryce Tudball (Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure), Bob McIver (Head of Building Control Services), Justin Farely (Legal), Jack Booth (Principal Committee Co-ordinator).

## **1. FILMING AT MEETINGS**

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

## **2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Worrell.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **4. URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **5. DEPUTATIONS / PETITIONS / PRESENTATIONS / QUESTIONS**

There were no deputations.

## **6. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED**

To confirm and sign the minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee meetings held on 27 May 2021, 31 January 2022, and 23 May 2022 as a correct record.

## **7. ADOPTION OF THE NORTH LONDON WASTE PLAN**

The chair introduced the item. She informed the committee that Councillor Carlin, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning, wanted to make a comment on the item, as the plan came under her portfolio.

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Private Renters and Planning said that the plan before the committee had a long genesis. It had gone through substantial amendments following extensive consultation with residents and interested groups. The plan had also been reviewed by a Planning Inspector appointed by

the Secretary of State who had judged the plans to be sound. The primary changes were the redrawn site for Pinkham Way and the need for biodiversity on the sites. The plan had recycling at its core, which was a priority for the council.

The chair invited the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability and the Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure to introduce the report.

The Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure highlighted that the item concerned the adoption of the North London Waste Plan (NLWP), the committee were asked to recommend it to cabinet with any comments. The following was outlined from the plan:

- The NLWP was a plan that:
  - o Covered seven boroughs;
  - o Planned for waste for the next 15 years;
  - o Identifies areas for potential waste management use; and
  - o Sets out policies for waste planning applications.
- The differences between the NLWP and the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) were demarcated. The central difference being that the latter was an authority, with its own governance structures. The NLWP was not an authority, it was a badge for a joint project across seven London boroughs;
- Timescales and community engagement:
  - o 2012 original NLWP deemed unsound;
  - o February 2012 cabinet agree new NLWP;
  - o 2013-14 community engagement;
  - o July 2015 cabinet approves the plan after formal consultation;
  - o January 2019 approved by cabinet and full council;
  - o November 2019 examination hearings;
  - o Modifications in response to community input;
  - o October – December 2020 community consultation on modifications;
  - o October 2021 Planning Inspector found the plan to be legally compliant, considering it to be sound;
  - o Seven councils to adopt plan, four already have done so;
  - o The plan currently at the final stage;
- Area allocations:
  - o Pinkham Way/ Friern Barnet Sewage Works. Significant modifications had been made to this site after community consultation. The Planning Inspector had found the plan to be sound; and
  - o Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham. Both sites were designated as Strategic Industrial Locations. Therefore, they were already suitable for waste disposal.
  - o None of the above areas had been identified as suitable to contain integrated resource recovery facilities, such as an incinerator;
- The importance of the NLWP
  - o Ensure the sustainable and self-sufficient management of waste;
  - o An opportunity to apply environmental controls, while avoiding speculative applications
  - o Would support the production of the new local plan, providing a baseline for waste planning uses over the next 15 years.
- Next steps

- 21 June 2022 to be considered, with comments from Strategic Planning Committees, by cabinet; and
- 18 July 2022 to be adopted by full council.
- Other boroughs
  - The following boroughs had adopted the plan:
    - Barnet;
    - Hackney;
    - Islington; and
    - Waltham Forest.
  - Awaiting approval from:
    - Camden;
    - Enfield; and
    - Haringey.

In response to councillors questions the Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability Planning and the Interim Head of Planning, Policy, Transport, and Infrastructure provided the following answers:

The predictions set out in the NLWP were reflecting targets set out by the Greater London Authority's *The London Plan* for waste and those set by the NLWA. Haringey Council planning were not responsible for these targets, which were fed into the plan making process. The council planning authority had responsibility for planning judgements around land allocation. The methodology for these planning judgements were set out in *National Planning Policy for Waste (2014)* which was alongside the *National Planning Policy Framework*. The Planning Inspector had scrutinised these elements in the public hearing, ensuring that the council were not planning for too much or too little waste; concluding that the land allocations based on projections were sound. It was added that the NLWP was a 15-year plan, if targets were to change then the council would have the opportunity to review these targets.

A councillor noted that he was worried by an assessment set out in the Planning Inspector report, at Appendix A, which said that 'the Plan includes objectives and policies designed to secure that waste development and use of land for such purposes within the Plan area contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change'. He was worried by this assessment, as he believed it reflected a lack of ambition within the plan, due to the need to follow policy that had been set by national government. The Assistant Director relayed that where the council as planning authority could shape the direction of NLWP it would be looking to actively tackle climate change. For example, a considerable amount of the plan was centred around minimising transportation frequency.

Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham were both sites designated as Strategic Industrial Locations. Therefore, they were already suitable for waste disposal. The plan was not proposing to change these designations. The plan gave additional protection to these areas through applying additional environmental policies and controls. There was a specific policy that steered development as far away from residential property as possible. If the plan were not adopted these safeguards would not be part of planning policy.

The area allocation for Brantwood Road and North-East Tottenham was set out at Appendix D, pages 270 and 274. The Brantwood Road allocation covered the following roads:

- Brantwood Road;
- West Road; and
- Tariff Road.

The North-East Tottenham allocation covered the following roads:

- Garman Road;
- Sedge Road;
- Lee Side Road;

Regarding Pinkham Way and the designation as SINC and proposal of public access to the current undeveloped site. The two were not mutually exclusive land uses, often it was possible to have a SINC that was compatible with public access. It was standard practice as it was thought to promote biodiversity. It was important to manage the space in the correct way to ensure compatibility. Two key pieces of evidence for Local Plan were:

- An employment land study. Which would be reported back to the committee at a future date; and
- An updated SINC study, which provided an update on biodiversity across the borough.

There were no specific plans currently about transportation via rail and water, it was referred to in the document in a general sense.

A councillor commented that in the reports pack it said that the aim of NLWP was to 'improve the health of residents and tackle deprivation' across the seven boroughs. It also stated that:

'Northumberland Park has a higher level of multiple deprivation than average, and is in the lowest 20% in the country, with the highest Universal Credit claimant count in the borough.'

Factoring in these considerations would there be opportunity for stricter measures around traffic in this area. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability said that the traffic impact on this area could be scrutinised fully at a planning stage, where the latest environmental controls would be applied. This would create enhanced controls compared to similar older sites that had not been subject to the same degree of controls. In terms of the deprivation in the area any planning application for the site would have to provide a training and skills obligation. Requirements could be set on this topic to support the local area.

A councillor commented that he was fully supportive of the plan. This was based on the fact that if this plan were rejected, any waste operator could bid for land use in area in Haringey. If the plan were accepted waste operators would be restricted to the land allocations proposed in the NLWP.

The plan had scrutinised adjacent land uses, this had been looked at by an independent Planning Inspector, and planning officers have ensured that effective

safeguards are in place to minimise disruption to existing and new residential developments.

Pinkham Way allocated land had split ownership, NLWA owning the north half and London Borough of Barnet owning the southern half; no part of the allocation falls within metropolitan open land.

NLWP was dealing with policy and future planning applications. The wider issues around targets, the council's relationship with NLWA, and Veolia contracts were not part of the NLWP. These issues would be dealt with by officers concerned with waste disposal in the Environment and Neighbourhoods directorate. In relation to these issues, planning officers would be able to suggest design guidance on waste disposal and minimising disruption to residents. In terms of overall strategic planning policy, concerns around proximity to residents, designing sites to be neighbourhood friendly, and underground waste collection can be factored into the new the Local Plan.

### **RESOLVED**

- a. To note the content of this report and the Inspector's Report on the North London Waste Plan (set out in Appendix A); and
- b. To agree to refer this report, attached with councillors' comments, and the appended documents to cabinet and full council with the recommendation to adopt the North London Waste Plan (Appendix C) including Main Modifications (Appendix B) and associated changes to the Policies Map (Appendix D).