

## **ADDENDUM REPORT**

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

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2022/0967	<b>Ward:</b> White Hart Lane
<b>Address:</b> 313 The Roundway and 8-12 Church Lane, London, N17 7AB	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new Class E/F1 floorspace at ground floor and residential C3 units with landscaping and associated works.	

### **Additional Consultation Comments (Amendments to Appendix 3)**

**TfL** - have confirmed their support for the application subject to conditions and legal requirements. These comments are reported below:

*Your approach to conditions is acceptable to TfL, with regards to Road Safety Audit, they will as part of the Section 278 with TfL needed to address the safety concerns raised in the RSA Stage 1 and provided a Stage 2 audit and designers response. Subject to securing appropriate condition, TfL has no objection to the Council approving this application.*

**LBH Transportation Officer** - has also provided additional comments set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

*Transportation still do not support this application given the shortfall in meeting London Plan standards for blue badge parking. It is acknowledged that there is a neutral effect on the cycle and pedestrian facility along Church Lane. The servicing arrangements are not optimal either from the transportation perspective.*

### **Amendments to the Committee Report**

#### **Description of the development:**

The description of the development (see box above) has been amended as follows (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**).

*Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new Class **E/F1 floorspace** at ground floor and residential C3 units with landscaping and associated works.*

This change is to reflect the flexible nature of the ground floor uses being extended following discussions with the applicant to include those uses within Use Class F1 (which includes galleries/museums). This could facilitate the use of the non-residential space for purposes related to Bruce Castle Museum.

### **Paragraphs 6.23 and 6.24:**

Amended to reflect the use class changes referenced above, as follows (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**).

*The proposed development would provide 600sqm of new employment space in the form of flexible Class E/**Class F1** floor space. This is currently anticipated to be in the form of workspace, **retail space or exhibition space**. The applicant has requested flexibility in the exact final uses to ensure the **new units** would be occupied. It is understood that these end uses would provide **up to** 50 new jobs at the site **depending on the exact final uses**.*

*Despite the overall reduction in floorspace it is considered that the proposed development would maximise the new employment on site by providing flexible Class **E/F1** uses along the whole available street frontage on the Roundway. The number and quality of jobs would significantly increase, as described above. The environmental quality of the site would improve substantially. Residential amenity would be protected through conditions and the functionality of existing employment activities respected. Broadband connections would be secured through condition.*

### **Paragraphs 6.62 – 6.64:**

The inclusion of paragraphs 6.62, 6.63 and 6.64 are a typographical error and are hereby removed from the report.

### **Paragraphs 6.136 and 6.145 (Transportation Section):**

Following the revised comments from the Transportation Officer as described above the following paragraphs of the committee report are hereby amended:

#### **Paragraph 6.136 (Servicing)**

*Two loading bays of 12 metre length would service the development – one on The Roundway and one on Church Lane. Both bays could accommodate waste vehicle and large delivery vehicles. The bay on Church Lane requires 3 metres of clear space at either end to allow ease of access. The siting of these service bays is supported in principle by the Council's Transportation Officer and Transport for London. Further discussions are required in order to ascertain the most efficient loading bay layout and management arrangements. This matter can be resolved through condition.*

#### **Paragraph 6.145 (Cycle Parking and Infrastructure)**

*The lack of car capping for this development given the 'event day' nature of the local CPZ means that a significant increase in local on-street parking would be expected. Much of this is expected to be accommodated on Church Lane. Church Lane is part of Cycle Superhighway 1 and the cycle lane is contraflow in this area. As such, it is an important piece of Haringey's cycling infrastructure. The provision of four new parking spaces and a loading bay (in*

*place of three parking spaces and two vehicle access points) on Church Lane would, when all parking spaces and the loading bay are occupied, reduce the space available for cyclists to safely find refuge if required when vehicles are passing (which would occur in a southerly direction only in this street as it is one-way only). However, it is expected that the loading bay would not be occupied at all times and it would provide a large space suitable for waiting cyclists when vacant. Furthermore, the development would remove two vehicle access points from the existing site which currently permit vehicles to turn from the existing commercial premises into oncoming cycle traffic, which itself is a significant safety concern. The Council's Transportation Officer has provided revised comments on this application, which state that the development would have a neutral impact on the cycle infrastructure adjacent to the site.*

### **Amendments to Heads of Terms**

Discussions with the applicant on the proposed heads of terms have continued since the committee report was published. The following amendments and additional heads have been agreed (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**):

#### **5) Highway works to be secured through a s278 agreement (**in consultation with Transport for London**)**

- Works shall include relocation of variable message sign on The Roundway, if required

#### **9) Employment and skills plan**

- **Including a contribution towards employment and skills initiatives of £34,400**

#### **11) Monitoring**

- 5% of total financial heads (excluding carbon offset)
- £500 per non-financial head
- **Estimated £5,720**

#### **12) Council to have first option to purchase the proposed affordable housing**

### **Amendments to Condition 11 (Appendix 1)**

Condition 11 has been amended since the committee report was published following the revised comments from the Transportation Officer (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**):

**11) The approved development shall not be occupied until a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London. The DSP shall include details of alternative loading and servicing arrangements, if feasible, following**

**consultation with the Council's Transportation Officer and Transport for London.** The DSP shall be updated in writing and re-submitted to the Local Planning Authority within the first six months of occupation or at 75% occupancy, whichever comes first. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

## **Appendix 1- Additional transportation comments**

*Considering the assessment of existing versus proposed highway arrangements with respect to the cycling facility for CS1.*

*At present there is two way cycling along Church Lane, which is one way southbound for vehicles from All Hallows Road, so northbound cyclists are cycling contraflow to vehicular traffic.*

*The assessment considers the conditions for contraflow cycling without a formal contraflow cycle lane.*

*TfL's London Cycle Design Standards and the DFT document LTN 1/20 consider the appropriate arrangements for this situation, and essentially, they require a minimum overall carriageway width of 4.6m for the situation within Church Lane (as in contraflow cycling taking place without a formal cycle lane and parking to one side of the road). There is also reference to the streets needing to have low vehicle flows as well. There is no traffic flow information provided by the applicant however anecdotally it is considered to be a lightly trafficked street.*

*At present, the 4.6 overall width is achieved along Church Lane, and with the current configuration between 2.4m and 2.8m of clear width carriageway is available adjacent to parking bays.*

*With the proposed arrangements revising the parking and loading arrangements along Church Lane, including inseting the footway and loading bays by 1 metre, there is between 2.9 and 3.0m clear carriageway width provided adjacent to the edges of the parking bays along the development boundary. it reverts to the existing 4.6m overall width north and south of the site. Therefore, there is very slightly more clear carriageway width than at present along the boundary of the development.*

*Whilst the length of kerbside that has parking bays along it will be reducing (within which cyclists can take refuge) it is acknowledged that the redevelopment and associated reinstatement of crossovers to full height kerb and footway will remove entry and exit manoeuvres along Church Lane.*

*To summarise with respect to consideration of the existing/proposed cyclist facility for CS 1, Transportation consider that there is no real tangible benefit arising from this redevelopment but equally there is no detriment compared to present. So in balance there is no objection to this aspect of the proposals. It should be noted though that the Borough's Walking and cycling action plan does seek for development to contribute towards delivering improvements in walking and cycling infrastructure and it is disappointing that the opportunity has not been taken to improve the situation.*

### **Footway changes**

*The footway/pedestrian facility along Church Lane will benefit from the reinstatement of crossovers along it, however it is also noted that the footway will narrow to the immediate north end of the development to 2.0m wide, plus need to*

*realign to suit the insetting of the highway to accommodate parking and loading. In balance this is considered neutral by Transportation.*

#### *Loading arrangements*

*The applicant has proposed changing their proposals for Church Lane from an 18m loading bay to implementation of double yellow lining with associated 'blips' to prevent any loading or parking activity between the AM and PM peak periods. This is a preferable arrangement to implementing a formal loading bay for a very low number of delivery and servicing movements, as it will keep this length free of vehicles during the AM/PM peak periods and provide opportunities for cyclist refuse during the traditionally busiest periods of the day.*

*Overall, with respect to loading the transportation view is still that this is an inefficient way of dealing with delivery and servicing movements as one loading bay would suffice for the whole development or alternatively off street servicing should be taking place.*

#### *Blue badge parking*

*This development proposal still does not meet the London Plan requirements for blue badge parking as previously detailed and discussed.*

#### *Summary*

*The latest note from the applicant's transportation consultant has been read and reviewed.*

*In balance, Transportation still do not support this application given the shortfall in meeting London Plan standards for blue badge parking. It is acknowledged that there is a neutral effect on the cycle and pedestrian facility along Church Lane. The servicing arrangements are not optimal either from the transportation perspective.*