

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2008/0303	Ward: Tottenham Green
Address: 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.	
Existing Use: Retail and Residential	Proposed Use: Mixed Use
Applicant: Grainger (Seven Sisters) Ltd	
Ownership: Private/Public	
Date received: 06/02/2008 Last amended date: 12/07/2011	
Drawing number of plans: 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 by Pollard Thames Edwards Architects January 2008.	
Case Officer Contact: Jeffrey Holt	
PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:	
Tube Lines Conservation Area Road Network: C Road	
RECOMMENDATION	
GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions and subject to s106/s278 Legal Agreement and direction of the GLA.	

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The application proposes the demolition of all buildings on site and the erection of a modern mixed use development with retail on the ground floor of the Seven Sisters, High Road and West Green Road frontages and flats on the upper floors. Development on Suffield Road will be completely residential. In total 197 private market dwellings are proposed.

Prior to and during the life of the application, the council and the applicants have engaged with key stake holders to develop a scheme which addresses local issues while delivering major regeneration.

The application was originally approved in December 2008 however the planning consent was quashed in June 2010 by the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal considered that the Planning Committee had not fully discharged its duty under section 71 of the Race Relations Act, 1976. Following this decision the application is now being re-determined. Physically, the scheme is mostly unchanged however a modified s106 agreement is proposed.

In re-determining the application, officers had regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act 2010. An independent Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken by URS Scott Wilson and it was found that the proposal is unlikely to give rise to major negative equality impacts provided all the measures set out in the s106 agreement are honoured in full and in a timely manner

The development is considered to deliver regeneration through new quality retail space, including new accommodation for the Seven Sisters Market (following their temporary relocation facilitated by the developer); quality family housing; quality amenity space and children's play space; and improvements to the public realm. The development is a high quality modern design suitable for a distinctive site and it will not cause significant harm to public and private transport networks or neighbouring amenity.

The provision of affordable housing was found to be unviable and this has been verified independently by District Valuer Services (DVS).

The development will involve the loss of identified Heritage Assets through the demolition of buildings in a Conservation Area, some of which are locally listed. The harm caused by the loss of these Heritage Assets is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits delivered by the scheme.

The applicant has engaged directly with existing residents and business on site, particularly the market traders, and has proposed a package of measures to compensate for their inevitable displacement. These measures were proposed following input from the affected residents and traders as well as the recommendations in the Equalities Impact Assessment and those from the GLA. Implementation of these measures will be secured through a s106 agreement.

On balance it is the officers' view that the scheme is consistent with planning policy and that subject to appropriate conditions and s106 contributions the application should be approved subject to direction of the GLA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS	
2.0	PLANNING HISTORY	
3.0	PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION	
4.0	RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY	
5.0	CONSULTATION	
6.0	ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION	
	Application background	6.2
	Regeneration Policy Context	6.3 - 6.9
	Development Brief	6.10 - 6.18
	Regeneration Benefits	6.19 - 6.30
	Retail Uses	6.31 - 6.33
	Seven Sisters Market	6.34 - 6.46
	Residential	6.47 - 6.50
	Density	6.51 - 6.53
	Affordable Housing	6.54 - 6.56
	Viability	6.57 - 6.59
	Dwelling Mix	6.60 - 6.62
	Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access	6.63 - 6.64
	Conservation	6.65 - 6.79
	Design	6.60 - 6.112
	Public Art	6.113 - 6.114
	Amenity space	6.115
	Children's Play space	6.116 - 6.118
	Contamination	6.119
	Archaeology	6.120
	Sustainability Energy	6.121 – 6.125
	Traffic and Parking	6.126 - 6.133
	Air Quality	6.134 - 6.137
	Community Safety	6.138 - 6.144
	Drainage	6.145
	Noise and Vibration	6.146 - 6.147
	Daylight and Sunlight	6.148 - 6.150
	Environmental Impact Assessment	6.151 - 6.154

Equalities Impact Assessment	6.155 - 6.163
Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement	6.164 - 6.182

7.0	HUMAN RIGHTS
8.0	DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT
9.0	PREDETERMINATION
10.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
11.0	RECOMMENDATION 1
12.0	RECOMMENDATION 2
13.0	REASONS FOR APPROVAL

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1:** Consultation responses
- Appendix 2:** Planning Policies
- Appendix 3:** Summary of Equalities Impacts and Recommendations by URS
Scott Wilson and conditions/s106 provisions in response
- Appendix 4:** Equalities Impact Assessment prepared by URS Scott Wilson
- Appendix 5:** Executive Summary of Toolkit Analysis by DVS
- Appendix 6:** Development Management Forum Minutes
- Appendix 7:** Summary of GLA reports
- Appendix 8:** GLA reports
- Appendix 9:** Court of Appeal judgement
- Appendix 10:** Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief

1. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1.1 The Wards Corner site is a prominent site located on the Western side of Tottenham High Road comprises 227 to 259 High Road 709 – 723 Seven Sisters Road 1a – 11 West Green Road and 8 – 30 Suffield Road which are 2/3 storey Victorian properties. The net site area is 0.65 of a hectare. The site contains the former Wards Corner Department Store and is situated above the Seven Sisters Victoria Line Underground Station and tunnels.
- 1.2 The site comprises retail and commercial floorspace on the ground and first floors on the High Road footage with retail commercial on the ground floor with residential above on the other two main frontages. Suffield Road is different in character being a relatively quiet residential street. There are currently 33 residential units falling within the boundary of the site.
- 1.3 The front part of the site falls within the West Green Road/Seven Sisters Conservation Area. The Tottenham High Road Regeneration Strategy (2002) and Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor Policy AC3 identifies Wards Corner as a key Regeneration site. The site falls within the Bridge New Deal for Communities Area. The site is the subject of the Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief dated January 2004.
- 1.4 West Green Road/Seven Sisters shopping area is classified as a District Centre in the Unitary Development Plan. The total retail floorspace on site is currently 3,182sq metres. The existing buildings currently incorporate an indoor market comprising 36 separate units. Currently a number of the traders are Colombian or Spanish speaking. The site has a public transport accessibility level of 6 (where 1 is low and 6 is high).

2. PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.1 This report to Planning Committee is for the re-determination of application ref: HGY/2008/0303, which was approved in December 2008. In June 2010 the decision was quashed by the Court of Appeal (see Appendix 9). Further information relating to the background of the current application is set out in section 6.2 Application Background.
- 2.2 Previous to this application, there is no significant planning history in relation to the application site. There have been many small applications in relation to each of the individual buildings, these are not recorded here in the interests of brevity but can be found on the Council's website and in appendix 1 of the applicant's initial planning statement of January 2007.
- 2.3 HGY/2008/0177 – NOT DETERMINED – The applicant was the Wards Corner Coalition - Erection of first floor rear extensions, alterations to rear elevation. Alterations to front elevation, including new bays at first floor level and dormer windows to front roof slope, installation of new shopfront, alterations to 3 storey

corner block, internal alterations to create new shops/workshops/offices/cafe (A3) use on ground / first floors and creation of 8 x one bed flats at second floor.

- 2.4 The above application was not determined by Haringey Council and the applicants submitted an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) on grounds of non-determination. The appeal was lodged 15 May 2010 but it was not accepted by PINS as the appeal was submitted more than 6 months after the expiry date of the application. However, once an appeal is made to PINS the Local Planning Authority is unable to determine the application.
- 2.5 HGY/2008/0322 – GRANTED 17/11/2008-Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing buildings 227 – 259 High Road 1a,1b and 1 West Green Road N15.

3. **PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION**

- 3.1 The proposed development comprises retail on the ground floor of the Seven Sisters Road, High Road and West Green Road frontages. A variety of unit sizes, including provision for an indoor market is proposed amounting in a total 3700 sq metres of floorspace with access via a secure service road with gated entrance onto Suffield Road. A cafe-bar/restaurant is proposed at first floor level on the High Road frontage. The residential development comprises 197 new flats at first floor level and above and apart from 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. The proposal includes the provision of 44 car parking spaces, including 3 disabled spaces in the basement car park.

4. **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

- 4.1 The scheme is assessed against planning policy at a National, regional and local level, including relevant:
- National Planning Policy Guidance;
 - National Planning Policy Statements;
 - The London Plan 2008 (consolidated with changes since 2004);
 - Haringey's adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006; and
 - Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents.

Planning For Growth

- 4.2 In March 2011, the Minister for Decentralisation made a statement calling for local planning authorities to support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development with appropriate weight given to the need to support economic recovery.

Draft Replacement London Plan

4.3 After a consultation in 2008, the Mayor decided to create a replacement Plan rather than amend the previous London Plan. Public consultation on the Draft Replacement London Plan took place until January 2010 and its Examination in Public closed on 8 December 2010. The panel report is expected in March 2011, with a final adoption due in late 2011.

Haringey LDF Core Strategy

4.4 Haringey’s draft Core Strategy has been submitted to the Secretary of State for an Examination in Public (EiP). This EiP commenced in 28th June with the binding Inspector’s report expected in October/November 2011. As a matter of law, some weight should be attached to the Core Strategy policies which have been submitted for EiP however they cannot in themselves override the Haringey’s adopted Unitary Development Plan (2006) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Haringey Development Management DPD

4.5 The consultation draft of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) was issued in May 2010 Following the responses received a proposed submission draft will be published in Spring 2012. The DM DPD is at an earlier stage to the Core Strategy and can only be accorded limited weight.

4.6 A full list of relevant planning policy can be found in Appendix 2.

5. CONSULTATION

5.1 The council undertook wide consultation with both statutory consultees and local residents. A table of all consultees can be found below.

<i>Statutory</i>	<i>Internal</i>	<i>External</i>
Greater London Authority (GLA) English Heritage Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) Met Police Government Office for London (GoL) London Fire Brigade Environmental Agency	Transportation Group Cleansing Building Control Conservation Design Regeneration Policy Design Panel	Amenity Groups Wards Corner Community Coalition Tottenham Civic Society Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) The Bridge NDC LB Hackney LB Waltham Forest Local Residents Total No of Residents Consulted: 2,754

--	--	--

- 5.2 The application has been put out to consultation twice. The first consultation occurred in February 2008 when the application was first validated. This first consultation generated 365 objections and 27 expressions of support from local residents as well as 11 neutral comments or responses from groups and statutory consultees.
- 5.3 Following the Judicial Review the application was put out to consultation a second time in January 2011. To date, this second consultation generated 487 objections, of which 426 are in the form of a standard letter. 13 responses were supportive of the plans and there were 7 responses from groups and statutory consultees. The Planning service has a policy of accepting comments right up to the Committee hearing and in view of this the figure is likely to rise further before the planning application is determined.
- 5.4 The scheme was presented to the Haringey Design Panel in October 2007 and feedback was broadly positive. As there have been no significant design changes in the scheme it was felt unnecessary to re-consult the Design Panel.
- 5.5 Two Development management Forums were held on the 20th March 2008 and 1st February 2011. Approximately 200 residents attended each forum. The minutes are attached as Appendix 6 of this report.
- 5.6 Officers have considered all consultation responses and have commented on these in Appendix 1. It is considered that the scheme is acceptable in the context of these consultation responses.

ICM Poll

- 5.7 M&N PR consultants have submitted a poll carried out by ICM from the 2nd to 13th of May 2008 on the instruction of the applicant in relation to the proposed development stating that a significant number of poll respondents had not visited the market and only 19% shop there regularly. The poll went on to find that the respondents felt unsafe in the area at night. That many people thought that investment in the area was a good idea. That many favoured the provision of high street shops and local traders. Retaining period buildings was not seen as a priority. Tackling crime was the most important issue. The methodology and results of which are shown in summary below:

Methodology

- Interviewed 500 residents in post code areas N15 4, N15 5 and N15 6
- Aged over 18+
- Over the telephone
- Between 1 – 12 May 2008 Weighted by age and area i.e. approximately the same number of people were polled in each age range and area

Key Statistics

- 57% of respondents had never visited Seven Sisters market, and only 19% of respondents shop at the market once a month or more often
- 55% feel unsafe visiting the area at night (including 68% of people aged 18 – 24). This rose to 62% amongst women
- 81% think substantial investment in the wards Corner area is a good idea
- 63% favoured the option of providing retail units for use by both high street shops and local traders, compared to only 30% who wanted retail focused around the existing and local traders
- When asked “what would you say is the most important issue that needs to be addressed at the wards Corner site?”, only 4% actually specified that architecture/retaining period buildings was a priority
- less than those who suggested better street lighting
- Only 3% (17 people out of 500) specified that keeping the market was important – the same amount who asked for more green areas to be included
- Tackling crime was the overwhelming main priority for respondents, with 42% specifying this option. Providing a better range of shops and making the area more attractive were joint second with 18%each.

6. ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

6.1 The main issues in respect of this application are considered to be:

- 1) Application background
- 2) Regeneration Policy Context
- 3) Development Brief
- 4) Regeneration Benefits
- 5) Retail Uses
- 6) Seven Sisters Market
- 7) Residential
- 8) Density
- 9) Affordable Housing
- 10) Dwelling Mix
- 11) Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access
- 12) Conservation
- 13) Design
- 14) Public Art
- 15) Amenity space
- 16) Children’s Play space
- 17) Contamination
- 18) Archaeology
- 19) Sustainability Energy
- 20) Traffic and Parking
- 21) Air Quality
- 22) Community Safety
- 23) Drainage
- 24) Noise and Vibration

- 25)Daylight and Sunlight
- 26)Environmental Impact Assessment
- 27)Equalities Impact Assessment
- 28)Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement

Application Background

6.2 This is a re-determination of the planning application ref: HGY/2008/0303. A timeline of key events relating to this application is provided below:

- 06/02/2008** Planning and associated Conservation Area Consent applications received
- 12/02/2008** Planning Application validated under ref: HGY/2008/0303 and consultation letters sent to statutory consultees, third parties and local residents
- 14/02/2008** Conservation Area Consent application validated under ref: HGY/2008/0322 and consultation letters sent to statutory consultees, third parties and local residents
- 20/03/2008** Development Management Forum held
- 17/11/2008** Planning Committee resolve to approve planning application and Conservation Area Consent application.
- 24/12/2008** Planning decision to approve scheme issued
- 16/06/2009** Judicial Review hearing held
- 14/07/2009** Judicial Review Dismissed
- 05/05/2010** Judicial Review Appeal Hearing
- 22/06/2010** Judicial Review Appeal Allowed: Planning consent quashed

In reaching its decision the Court of Appeal considered that the Planning Committee had not fully discharged its duty under section 71 of the Race Relations Act, 1976 in that it did not have due regard to “the need to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different of different racial groups”.

- 22/12/2010** Following discussion with Haringey officers, supplementary planning information is submitted by Grainger seeking re-determination of the application.

- 19/01/2011** Consultation letters sent to statutory consultees, third parties and local residents based
- 01/02/2011** Development Management Forum held
- 20/07/2011** Application taken to Planning Committee with recommendation to approve

Regeneration Policy Context

- 6.3 PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Communities sets out the Government's position in relation to achieving identified planning objectives including providing urban regeneration through mixed-use development, reducing the need to travel and promoting efficient use of land through higher density and use of previously developed land and buildings.
- 6.4 PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth states that the Government's overarching objective is sustainable economic growth. Policy EC4.1 states that Local planning authorities should proactively plan to promote competitive town centre environments and provide consumer choice. Policy EC10.1 states that local planning authorities should adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning applications for economic development. Planning applications that secure sustainable economic growth should be treated favourably. Furthermore, Policy EC10.2 requires local planning authorities to assess the impact of schemes in terms of their climate change impact, transport accessibility, design, impact on economic and physical regeneration including impact on deprived areas and social inclusion and impact on local employment.
- 6.5 The Minister for Decentralisation's statement "Planning For Growth" calls for local planning authorities to support enterprise and facilitate housing, economic and other forms of sustainable development with appropriate weight given to the need to support economic recovery. It is considered that the regeneration of Wards Corner is consistent with the Minister's statement.
- 6.6 Policy AC3 'Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor' of the UDP 2006 seeks to promote regeneration through development along the Tottenham High Road corridor. The corridor is considered to be an area where redevelopment will act as a catalyst for regeneration of the High Road. Seven Sisters underground/Wards Corner is identified as being capable of being developed as a landmark mixed use development.
- 6.7 Policy AC4 'The Bridge – New Deal for Communities' UDP 2006 states that the Bridge New Deal for Communities (NDC) aims to improve the quality of life for residents by seeking to change the area so that it becomes a better place to live. The policy identifies Seven Sisters underground station/Wards Corner as an important site for redevelopment in the area and states that a development brief advocating mixed use development of the site has been prepared. The Bridge NDC programme closed in 2011 however its regeneration aims have

been incorporated into policies within the emerging Core Strategy.

- 6.8 Policy SP1 'Managing Growth' of the Core Strategy aims to manage growth by focusing Haringey's growth in the most suitable locations and manage it to make sure that the Council delivers the opportunities and benefits and achieve strong, healthy and sustainable communities for the whole of the borough. The application site is identified in Fig 2.1 Key Diagram and Fig 3.5 Seven Sisters Area of Change.
- 6.9 A number of changes were agreed at the Core Strategy's recent Examination in Public. In particular, the aspirations for the Seven Sisters Corridor under Policy SP1 were amended to state there is an "opportunity for ensuring that the Seven Sisters area and the tube and train station provides land marks/gateways to aid legibility through redevelopment and/or renewal" and that "Wards Corner regeneration should deliver new houses, shops and public realm improvements through redevelopment and/or renewal". It is therefore clear that Policy SP1 seeks to promote development within this location.

Development Brief

- 6.10 The Bridge NDC was a regeneration programme funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) as part of a national programme of renewal and regeneration in the most deprived wards in England. The programme began in 2001 and closed in early 2011.
- 6.11 The activities of the bridge NDC were led by the Communities Partnership Board. The Board was made up of twenty three members, 12 of whom were local residents. The Partnership Board was involved in promoting the redevelopment of Wards Corner for five years. The Community Conference day on 1st February 2003 informed residents of plans for the Wards Corner Project.
- 6.12 The NDC sponsored Atis Weatherall study in 2003 was a baseline report and evidence base which then led to the adoption of the Wards Corner Development Brief (See Appendix 10) which was approved in draft for public consultation by the Planning Applications Sub Committee on 7th July 2003. 12,000 households were circulated a summary leaflet, and the Development Brief was adopted in January 2004 by the Executive of the Council. Subsequently the NDC funded a selection competition to find a lead developer on the basis of the brief. Grainger PLC the current applicants were competitively selected in that process.
- 6.13 The Council formally adopted the brief in January 2004. The land covered by the brief included Apex House, however the brief focused on the Wards Corner site which is the one which was thought to be most likely to come forward for development. The brief states that the east of Haringey is recognised as a deprived area and that the area around the station is perceived as unsafe and suffers from a high degree of crime.
- 6.14 The brief states that the Council is taking a coordinated approach towards development along Tottenham High Road where there has been an overall lack

of investment in the building stock. The brief states that the Seven Sisters/Bridge NDC is responsible for the regeneration of the area and the brief site falls within their boundary. The brief also refers to the Boroughs Haringey Retail Capacity assessment (Sept 2003) which also identifies Wards Corner as a focus for development to improve the District Centres shopping environment.

- 6.15 The vision as stated in the brief is to “Create a landmark development that acts as a high quality gateway to Seven Sisters, providing mixed uses with improved facilities and a safer underground station access”.
- 6.16 The brief sets out a number of development principles. The first is a reiteration of the vision granted above. A series of urban objectives follow including new development should regenerate and improve the living and working environment and make the best use of the opportunities presented by the site. Development must enhance the Conservation Area. New buildings shall be of distinctive and modern design. Development should reflect the diversity of the community and improve the public realm and include public art. Development should be designed to reduce the opportunities for crime and improve pedestrian access and safety. Development should be mixed use and the houses lost in Suffield Road should be replaced as part of the scheme. The current application for the redevelopment of the wards Corner site has been submitted in the context of the planning brief. The application must be judged on its merits in relation to National, London and local planning policy and any other relevant material considerations including the criteria set out in the development brief.
- 6.17 The brief has been incorporated into the UDP 2006 and is consistent with the emerging Core Strategy. The development brief remains in force and is a material consideration when determining applications for development at Wards Corner.
- 6.18 It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the Development Brief.

Regeneration Benefits

- 6.19 The proposed development would result in the expansion and redesigning of the public pavement area in front of the High Road frontage. Existing street clutter would be removed. The mature plane tree will be retained. The entrance stairs to the Underground Station will be retained and reclad and covered by glass canopies. Two new retail kiosks will be located next to the existing entrance stairs. The public space is enlarged by recessing the proposed development in the centre of the High Road frontage. A large paved circle will be created shielded by an arc of trees. The space will be provided with high quality parking, street lighting, signage, bus stops, benches and other street furniture.
- 6.20 The proposed development would result in the provision of new shops, including trader’s market, café bar and restaurant including premises and kiosks for smaller independent retailers and incorporate space for community use. The proposed development would result in the provision of 197 homes on the site in

a mix of dwelling types to appropriate standards of design and layout arranged around a shared roof garden with seating, planting and play space. The proposed development would result in the physical regeneration of the site through comprehensive redevelopment which would represent investment in the area and would lead to further physical and social economic regeneration in line with Council Planning Policy.

- 6.21 The above analysis by the Council was carried out in 2008 but officers have carefully considered whether these conclusions still hold good. Their view remains that the need for regeneration remains the same, if not stronger.
- 6.22 According to the Office for National Statistics, the Wards Corner 'Lower Super Output Area 025D' or Wards Corner LSOA is the smallest statistical area covering Wards Corner. According to the Indices of Deprivation 2010, the Wards Corner LSOA is among the 5-10% most deprived neighbourhoods in England and Wales. While it is has fallen consistently within this band since 2004, since 2007, the area's index of deprivation has fallen from 2,846 to 1,805 where a lower number indicates a greater level of deprivation.
- 6.23 Since the application was first considered in 2008, a number of regeneration schemes have been approved elsewhere in the east of the Borough. These include the Tottenham Hotspur stadium redevelopment, Tottenham Town Hall and Hale Village at Tottenham Hale. These developments indicate there is a general trend of regeneration in the east of the Borough to which the Wards Corner scheme will play a complementary role.
- 6.24 The Bridge NDC have previously commissioned reports which assessed the likely impacts the proposal would have on the area.
- 6.25 In March 2006 the Bridge NDC commissioned a report by Cushman and Wakefield to assess the likely effect of the commercial floor space in the proposed development on the existing Seven Sisters Centre. (It does not deal with the residential proposals or the design). In summary the report states that the problems identified in the development brief appear to persist, and other issues are coming to the fore e.g. competition from other locations. In terms of national policy (Planning Policy Statement 6) the report concludes that the application represents a potentially beneficial development solution that will address many of these problems, and would conform with local planning policy and should significantly enhance the viability of the Seven Sisters Centre
- 6.26 In March 2008 the Bridge NDC commissioned a report by Shared Intelligence Report which assessed the proposed development in relation to the economic social and environmental well-being of the local area. In summary the report states that in comparison with the existing conditions the proposed development is likely to have positive benefits on all the aspects of social wellbeing assessed, housing, crime and the fear of crime, public transport services, public realm and training and employment.
- 6.27 Although these reports were commissioned prior to and during the initial consideration of the application in 2008, it is considered that their conclusions

still hold. This is because the factors identified in the reports are still present.

- 6.28 In the GLA Stage 1 report of July 2008, The London Development Agency comments on the scheme were as follows. The LDA supported the principle of development as this is recognised as a gateway location into the Borough, the LDA welcomes the incorporation of retail frontages onto Tottenham High Road, Seven Sisters Road and West Green Road. In addition, the provision of a range of retail accommodation of a size suitable for large national high street retailers, smaller local independent shops as well as a range of complementary facilities is welcomed as it will help to ensure an appropriate balance and mix of retailers is achieved.
- 6.29 The LDA welcomed the provision of small retail space suitable for start up businesses in order to support and promote a diverse retail offer on Tottenham High Road. This will support the Economic Development Strategy (EDS) objective to “address barriers to enterprise start – up growth and competitiveness”. The promotion of small retailers can also assist the needs of local business, small and medium sized enterprises (SME’s) and black and minority ethnic businesses which in turn can support the needs of the local community.
- 6.30 The GLA’s updated Stage 1 report issued 22nd June 2011 states that the GLA continues to welcome the regeneration of the site, particularly the significant improvements to the public realm and the improved quality of retail provision.

Retail Uses

- 6.31 The site lies within the West Green Road/Seven Sisters District Centre. The West Green Road and Tottenham High Road frontages are identified as primary frontages in the UDP. Seven Sisters Road is within a secondary frontage. The size and layout of the shops has been designed so that the large units intended for multiples are on the High Road frontage and the smaller units are on the West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road frontages where it is considered that they better match the type of shop and trading at these locations.
- 6.32 The proposed development will provide 3,792m² of new retail floor space, a net increase of 610m² above the existing provision on the site.
- 6.33 In the original proposed scheme the retail floor space was provided in the form of 19 units ranging in size from 319m² to the smallest being 41m². The larger units were and still are on the High Road frontage the smaller units are proposed to be on the West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road frontages. There is a small ground floor restaurant of 33m² and a first floor restaurant of 320m². Following consultation with local residents, community groups and the GLA, 5 proposed retail units on the Seven Sisters Road frontage were converted into an 876 sqm market area to accommodate the existing Seven Sisters Market. The replacement market is slightly smaller than the existing as it has a more efficient layout. It will be large enough to accommodate the same number of stalls as the existing market.

Seven Sisters Market

- 6.34 Policy 3D.3 of the London Plan, maintaining and improving retail facilities together with Policy TCR 1 Development in Town and Local Shopping Centres of the Haringey UDP sets out that boroughs should work with retailers and others to prevent the loss of retail facilities, including street and farmers' markets, that provide essential convenience and specialist shopping and to encourage mixed use development. Following discussions with the GLA in 2008, the applicant has agreed to re-provide the existing Seven Sisters Indoor Market in the space formerly allocated to retail units 2 to 6 incl. This has been identified as shown on drawing no P(00)01 including an illustrative layout for the market, subject to agreement with the market operator.
- 6.35 The market consists of numerous small retail units arranged in groups allowing visitors to circulate. There are 60 units however many of these have been combined into larger units. Currently there are approximately 40 separate traders. Those units which abut the pavement on the High Road also open out onto the street. The units are occupied by small businesses which trade mostly in retail goods such as clothing, household goods and music. There are also hair salons, travel agents, money transfer services and a number of cafes. There is a strong Latin American presence noticeable by the names of businesses and goods sold. The retail units are not set up on a daily basis as is usual in a stall-based market. As such, the market is considered to be more a retail hall made up of a series of small shops.
- 6.36 The market has been operating in this way since at least 2008 when the Bridge NDC commissioned Urban Space Management to assess the possibility of incorporating the market into the new development. The report considered the market to be a retail hall rather than a day-to-day stall-based market.
- 6.37 The re-provision of the indoor market is subject to reasonable conditions to ensure that the market is provided for the benefit of the current traders and that it will be successful in the long term.
- 6.38 The s106 agreement signed in 2008 required the proposed market operator to demonstrate that no less than 60% of the market traders that previously occupied the Seven Sisters market showed a formal interest in taking accommodation within the new market. This was to ensure that the new market closely followed the nature of the existing market. However, concerns have been expressed that, should a lower percentage of the market traders show a formal interest in returning, the market could be lost altogether.
- 6.39 Consequently, it is now proposed that the above requirement be replaced by one requiring the Market Operator to offer a first right to occupy to all existing traders on an exclusive and non-assignable licence of an equivalent stall in the new market area, on reasonable A1 open market terms. This replacement requirement is designed to offer greater confidence to the existing traders that they will be able to relocate to the site once the development is completed. The replacement market is large enough to accommodate all existing traders.

- 6.40 In addition the s106 will include obligations requiring that the market must be run by an experienced indoor market operator; this arrangement is to be in place not less than 12 months prior to the due practical completion date of the proposed development; a Market Lease must be in place not less than 6 months prior to the due practical completion date of the proposed development; and the rent will be for open market A1 use.
- 6.41 In order to assist with a number of practical issues identified relating to the temporary relocation of the market during the redevelopment of the site, the s106 will require Grainger and the Council to work together:
- to facilitate or fund a specialist facilitator to engage with the traders in order to find and provide temporary accommodation;
 - to liaise with those existing Spanish-speaking traders to promote their interests in the temporary accommodation; and
 - to engage with and provide appropriate business support and advice to all traders to secure the maximum number of expressions of interest to return to the site.
- 6.42 The above package will be funded by TfL from the land receipt that it will receive from the sale of part of the site to the applicant. Although this sale will not take place until two years from planning consent the applicant will fund the first two years of the package and will be refunded by TfL at a later date. This will occur through a s106 agreement. This package is identified in the independent equalities impact assessment as being key to the acceptability of the proposal in equalities terms.
- 6.43 The above package (“Market Facilitator Package”) is intended to assist the market to find a temporary location and to continue functioning. This package will run for five years from the granting of consent. This package includes a ‘market facilitator’ to work with traders to identify a temporary location, to work with the Spanish speaking traders to promote their interests in the temporary location and to provide appropriate business support and advice to all traders to secure the maximum number of expressions of interest to return to the site as well funding towards relocation costs and a three month rent free period in the temporary location. The Market Facilitator will also signpost existing businesses and employees towards existing appropriate bodies to assist business to continue trading or individuals to find suitable alternative employment.
- 6.44 Via the market facilitator, the market traders will be offered a reasonable opportunity to temporarily relocate to a suitable location for the duration of the construction period at Wards Corner. A ‘suitable location’ is defined as a single unit within or in close proximity to a defined town or district centre in a London Borough that provides the same space per trader, for those traders that wish to be relocated. Until timescales of construction emerge, it is not possible to give an indication of a possible location.

- 6.45 The applicant has also agreed to provide a minimum notice period of six months to market traders for vacant possession and is offering a compensation payment to assist with relocation expenses. This payment is in the form of £144,000 contribution to a “Trader’s Financial Assistance Sum” (an increase on the sum of £96,650 agreed in 2008). The traders do not have any tenancy rights, therefore this payment is voluntary.
- 6.46 The provision of retail and restaurant uses is in accordance with the Council’s retail planning policy. It is considered that this provision will enhance the vitality and viability of the District Centre by attracting new retailers to invest in a wider range of new shops both national and local resulting in more choice and a wider range of goods for sale in the local area.

Residential

- 6.47 It is well established that there is a need in Haringey and in London as a whole to provide new housing for a growing population. PPS 3 Housing states that local Planning Authorities should provide sufficient land but give priority to reusing previously developed land within urban areas.
- 6.48 Planning Policy HSG 1 New Housing Developments states that new housing developments will be permitted on sites with high accessibility to public transport facilities, and where a mix of house types tenure and sizes is provided where there is access to local services educational and community facilities and where an appropriate contribution towards ancillary community facilities or open space is made.
- 6.49 The site is identified in the UDP in planning policies AC3 ‘Tottenham High Road Corridor’, AC4 ‘The Bridge NDC’ as a development site for mixed use, and emerging Core Strategy Policy SP1 ‘Managing Growth’. The site is referred to directly as a site specific proposal SSP21 in the UDP. There is therefore no objection in principle to residential use on the site.
- 6.50 Core Strategy Policies SP1 and SP2 continue this approach.

Density

- 6.51 Table 3A.2 of the London Plan sets out ranges of acceptable densities for development according to the accessibility of the site and the scale of local development. This table confirms that higher density development, up to 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare may be acceptable where the proposal site is located within a central area with good public transport accessibility and predominantly comprises flats. The application site is within a defined town centre and has excellent public transport links by train, underground and bus. The proposed residential development is provided in the form of duplexes and flats. Table 3A.2 proposes a residential density of between 650 and 1,100 hrph for this type of site.
- 6.52 The proposed development proposes a total of 570 habitable rooms on a site with a gross area of 0.717 hectare. This results in a density of 795hrph, which is

consistent with the provisions of the London Plan.

- 6.53 The proposed density is also in accordance with Core Strategy Policy SP2 'Housing' as this policy is also based on Table 3A.2 of the London Plan.

Affordable Housing

- 6.54 UDP Policy HSG 4 Affordable Housing states that developments of 10 or more units will be required to include provision of affordable housing to meet an overall borough target of 50%. This target is consistent with Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan. Policy 3A.10 of the London Plan states that Targets should be applied flexibly, taking account of individual site costs, the availability of public subsidy and other scheme requirements. In addition, Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing states that a reduced provision of affordable housing can be agreed if full provision would have implications for the scheme's viability. This approach is continued in the Core Strategy.
- 6.55 In the case of the development of this site the applicants have stated that the costs of bringing the site forward for development are such that it is not possible to develop the site and provide affordable housing. The proposed development is receiving grant funding to allow the regeneration of the site and provision of affordable housing would make the scheme unviable. Further information can be found in the section 'Viability' below.
- 6.56 It should be noted that a number of nearby housing developments which include affordable housing are under construction or have been granted consent recently. These include 542 units at Hale Village, 109 units at Tottenham Town Hall, 22 at Stainby Road, N15, 17 at 596-606 High Road, N17 and 13 at 658 High Road, N17.

Viability

- 6.57 In accordance with national, London and local policy, the applicants have submitted an affordable housing 'toolkit' appraisal to support their case. The applicants submitted a toolkit appraisal when the application was first considered in 2008. This appraisal was submitted by the GLA to DVS, an arm of the Valuation Office Agency (VOA), for independent assessment. DVS agreed with the figures of the appraisal, which remains a confidential document, and concluded that the provision of affordable housing would make the scheme unviable.
- 6.58 As the application is now being re-determined, the applicants have submitted an updated appraisal. The Council has submitted the applicant's appraisal to DVS for independent assessment. DVS have reported that the appraisal is reasonably based but there are some disagreements on the build cost, finance rates and development programme. Accordingly DVS have undertaken their own appraisal which concluded that the scheme is viable but only without affordable housing. Although there was some disagreement between the applicant and DVS, both parties have come to the same conclusion that the

scheme is not viable if it included affordable housing.

- 6.59 The Council has entered into a development agreement with Grainger Trust to redevelop the application site (see section 'Development Agreement'). Grainger Seven Sisters Ltd are also bound by this agreement. The agreement requires the Council to provide any affordable housing required to be part of the development to be provided offsite with Apex House as a possible location for such provision. Officers are satisfied that due to the expense of developing the site and the associated implications for viability which have been independently confirmed as set out above, the scheme would not be viable if it included affordable housing. Therefore the provision of affordable Housing at Apex House and/or another suitable site or sites within the Borough is not required.

Dwelling Mix

- 6.60 Policy HSG 10 – Dwelling Mix of the Haringey UDP and Haringey Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provide advice in relation to new residential development and the dwelling mix that should be provided. The proposed mix of dwellings to be provided is:

5 x studio (2.5%)
48 x 1bed (24%)
107 x 2bed (54.5%)
37 x 3bed (19%)

- 6.61 For private housing, Figure 7.1 of the Housing SPD gives a mix of 1 bed 37%, 2 bed 30%, 3 bed 22% and 4 bed 11%. The residential element of the proposed development is predominantly 2 and 3 bed units. The one bed units are below the recommended mix and no four bed units are provided.
- 6.62 Due to the Town Centre location of the proposed development and the commercial nature of the three main frontages it is not considered a suitable location for larger family units. Therefore there are no 4 bed units proposed within the development and the majority of the larger family units are proposed on the Suffield Road frontage which is a relatively quiet residential location.

Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access

- 6.63 The applicant states that all the homes provided will be of Lifetime Homes standard with the exception of the 18 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 WC with shower which would enable the Lifetime Homes criteria to be fulfilled.
- 6.64 In accordance with the Council's Housing SPD, 20 flats, 10% of the total, will be Wheelchair accessible or easily adapted for wheelchair use.

Conservation

- 6.65 The application proposes the demolition of all buildings on site. The eastern half of the site is covered by the Tottenham High Road Corridor/Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area.
- 6.66 Conservation Area Consent (CAC) for the demolition of all buildings on site was granted 17 November 2008 and this permission remains extant. As such, the principle of demolition has been accepted and the applicant currently has consent to clear the site. However, in accordance with the re-determination of the application, the impact of the proposal in term of urban conservation is discussed here.
- 6.67 Several consultees and a significant number of local residents have objected to the demolition of all buildings on the site. These objections were received following the initial consultation of the scheme and the second consultation undertaken during its current re-determination. Responses in relation to conservation issues made by a number of key groups are briefly summarised below:

English Heritage (EH)

- English Heritage objected to the application following the initial consultation and maintain that objection in the letter in response to the second consultation. Both responses are summarised here
- English Heritage does not consider the criteria for their demolition, as set out in PPS5, to have been met. Additionally, they believe that the proposed new development, by virtue of its design, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Whilst they accept that all of these buildings require some degree of repair there is no evidence to assume they could not be repaired or refurbished.
- The proposal in effect removes any historic significance or local character from a large section of the conservation area and must therefore be considered to cause significant harm to the designated heritage asset.
- Unless the heritage assets are demonstrably beyond repair, have no longer term viability or their loss is outweighed by public benefits, there is presumption that they should be retained.
- Whilst English Heritage accepts the scheme itself would not be viable if the buildings were to be retained, there is little public benefit which could not be delivered through a conservation based scheme of repair and refurbishment of the existing buildings and public realm.

Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)

- The CAAC objected to the application following the initial consultation and maintain that objection in the letter in response to the second consultation. Both responses are summarised here

- There is no substantial community benefit that would result from the total or substantial demolition of these buildings so as to allow demolition as an exceptional case
- The proposed development will not enhance the Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area;
- It does not create a sense of place, being bland and lacking individual character;
- Its height, bulk and mass are too great for the area and will overpower other buildings and will destroy the character of the Conservation Area.

Tottenham Civic Society

- The Tottenham Civic Society objected to the application following the initial consultation and maintain that objection in the letter in response to the second consultation. Both responses are summarised here
- The design of the building is out of keeping and scale with the Conservation Area and therefore fails Policy CSV1 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.
- Regeneration must be heritage-led in order to be successful and to minimise the risk posed by unsustainable overdevelopment.
- the Wards Corner building at 227 High Road (1909) is unique to Haringey and is an interesting example of an early 20th C steel framed building. It contributes to the conservation area, local history and culture
- the costs of retaining the building stated by the applicant are not realistic

Wards Corner Coalition

- The Wards Corner Coalition objected to the application following the initial consultation and objected with the assistance of Planning Aid following the second consultation.
- The Wards Corner store building has local historical resonance, is locally listed, in a Conservation Area and referred to in the Development Brief and Character Appraisal as being of architectural interest
- PPS5 states that justification has to be made for the loss of the heritage asset to show substantial benefits of a scheme to outweigh its loss
- The re-provision of the Seven Sisters market is not a “substantial benefit”
- No consideration was given for alternative uses for the building as required by the other main test of PPS5

6.68 Local resident objections to demolition were on similar grounds to those objections made by the above groups

6.69 The application site is partially within a conservation area. Conservation Areas are ‘Designated Heritage Assets’ as defined in Annex 2 of PPS5. Policy HE6.1 of PPS5 requires all heritage assets to be assessed in terms of their ‘significance’ and the impact the development would have on them. The Heritage Assets are identified in the table below:

Building	Heritage Interest	Significance
227 High road (Locally listed)	Architectural	Low to moderate
229-245 (odd) High Road	Architectural	Low
247-249 High Road	Architectural	Low
251-253 High Road	Architectural	Low
255-259 (odd) High Road	Architectural	Low to moderate
1a-1b West Green Road (Locally listed)	Architectural	Low to moderate
1 West Green Road	Architectural	Low

6.70 The Tottenham High Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal identifies 227 High Road (Wards Corner Store), 255-259 (odd numbers) High Road and 1a-1b West Green Road as making positive contributions to the Conservation Area with the other buildings on site only making a neutral contribution. English Heritage have indicated in their representation that they consider the Appraisals assessment to be accurate.

6.71 The applicant’s assessment is broadly in agreement with that of the Council’s Character Appraisal in that it identifies 227 High Road, 255-259 High Road and 1a-1b West Green Road as making positive contributions to the Conservation Area.

6.72 The site located directly above Seven Sisters Underground Station which was constructed in the 1960s. The major construction works that were undertaken at that time are considered to have removed any potential for archaeological interest.

6.73 The scheme will involve the loss of all buildings on site, including those identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. This equates to a loss of heritage assets. PPS5 emphasises the desirability of conserving or enhancing heritage assets, the need to consider significance and extent of harm to heritage assets. The loss of these buildings is considered to constitute “substantial harm”.

6.74 Where a development causes “substantial harm” it must meet the test in Policy HE9.2 of PPS5. Consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that:

- (i) the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or

- (ii) (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term that will enable its conservation; and
- (c) conservation through grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is not possible; and
- (d) the harm to or loss of the heritage asset is outweighed by the benefits of bringing the site back into use

- 6.75 The policy requires development proposals to meet either criteria (i) or criteria (ii). The application is considered to meet criteria (i) in that the significant loss of significance is outweighed by the substantial public benefit of the development. The development will result in the creation of a public square and regeneration of the public realm around Seven Sisters Station, economic regeneration through the provision of high quality shops and the high quality re-provision of the Seven Sisters Market, and housing regeneration through the creation of 197 quality homes.
- 6.76 Although the development is only required to meet one of the criteria, the applicants have given some consideration to the requirements of criteria (ii). The applicant have considered variations of the scheme which retain one or more of the existing locally listed buildings on the site and have produced and financially appraised various options. None of these options were found to be financially viable or deliverable meaning that it would not be possible to deliver the public benefits which the current scheme provides. These financial appraisals were undertaken in 2008, however given the current economic climate, it is considered that their conclusions still hold good.
- 6.77 English Heritage have commented that “Unless the heritage assets are demonstrably beyond repair, have no longer term viability or their loss is outweighed by public benefits, their (sic) is presumption that they should be retained”. However, they do accept that the scheme itself would not be viable if the buildings were to be retained but go on to say there is little public benefit which could not be delivered through a conservation based scheme of repair and refurbishment. Following the applicants’ consideration of various conservation based schemes, officers consider that the loss of the heritage assets does bring public benefit which could not otherwise be delivered if the buildings were retained.
- 6.78 Although existing buildings are proposed to be demolished, proposed development has been designed with sensitivity to its location and the character of the Conservation Area. This is discussed in more detail in the sections under ‘Design’ below.
- 6.79 The setting of the Grade II listed former Barclays Bank at 220-224 High Road is considered to be unaffected by the scheme. It is separated from the site by the expansive High Road/West Green Road/Broad Lane junction and located approximately 70m away. No harm to the significance of this Heritage Asset would arise.

Design

- 6.80 Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' set out the Councils general design principles for new development in the Borough. Policy CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' also sets out the Councils planning policy requirements for development proposals in Conservation area, primarily that any new development should preserve or enhance the historic character and qualities of the buildings and/or the Conservation Area.
- 6.81 Policies UD3 'General Principles' and UD4 'Quality Design' set out the Councils general design principles for new development in the Borough. Policy CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' also sets out the Councils planning policy requirements for development proposals in Conservation Areas, primarily that any new development should preserve or enhance the historic character and qualities of the buildings and/or the Conservation Area.
- 6.82 In addition to the above policy, the Development Brief seeks a development which would provide an attractive and high quality landmark and gateway to the Seven Sisters/Tottenham High Road area; regenerate and improve the living and working environment and make best use of the opportunities presented by the site; enhance the conservation area; be of a distinctive and imaginative modern design; include active frontages, and visual variety and interest, onto the West Green Road, High Road and Seven Sisters Road frontages; take its cue from the richness and diversity of the communities and small shops in the West Green Road area; include significant and co-ordinated improvement to the public realm and incorporate the principles of sustainable design.
- 6.83 The applicants have submitted a detailed Design and Access Statement as part of their application submissions. The design statement documents the process of determining the current design up to submission in detail and deals with the way in which the physical and structural constraints have affected the outcome of the design.
- 6.84 The amount of development possible on the site is constrained by Seven Sisters Underground Station and associated tube lines. This limits the height of buildings in the middle of the site.
- 6.85 The close proximity of neighbouring buildings places limits on the height of development due to the impact on rights to light (see section 'Daylight and 'Sunlight'). The impacts of noise, vibration and air quality from surrounding road traffic and underground trains was also considered (see section 'Noise and Vibration').
- 6.86 Following consideration of these technical constraints, the applicants considered the context of urban form. The application site consists of an entire block bounded by Tottenham High Road, Seven Sisters Road, Suffield Road and West Green Road. Apart from the frontage to Suffield Road, which contains 2-storey Victorian terrace houses, the site is characterised by 2- and 3-storey Victorian and Edwardian buildings containing small shops with residential accommodation above.

- 6.87 Surrounding development varies. West Green Road is a busy street characterised by 3-storey mixed-use Victorian and Edwardian development. Seven Sisters Road is similar but is contrasted by Apex House, a modern 4 storey development. The High Road frontage benefits from a large pavement area which accommodates a bus stop and the entrances to the Underground station. The buildings opposite are modern with the exception of the Listed former Barclays Bank building adjacent to the large Tesco Supermarket.
- 6.88 The width of High Road and its spacious junctions with Seven Sisters Road and West Green Road/Broad Lane results in a large open area in front of the site. This area makes the site highly visible as there are wide vistas towards the site from various locations on the High Road. This situation gives the site a focus as a central and key location within the urban form.
- 6.89 The applicant's Design and Access Statement shows how the applicants have arrived at their design through careful consideration of the site's physical constraints and urban context. The proposed development takes the form of a comprehensive redevelopment in a style which comprises a modern interpretation of the architecture of Tottenham High Road using modern methods of construction. The design, whilst being modern, reflect the traditional elements of the existing buildings in the High Road through the appropriate proportions and sub-divisions of the facades and the dominant use of brick.
- 6.90 The building is taller than surrounding development however the integrity of the site as a single block coupled with the large open space created by High Road and nearby junctions means that the site is most appropriate for a taller development. The height of neighbouring Apex House and the verticality of the large mature trees leading up from the south along High Road, act as transitional elements which could point toward a taller building. The result is a design which realises the distinct character of the site as a focus for more intense development.
- 6.91 The tallest elements of the building are restricted to the north-east corner and southern edge of the site. This is in response to the presence of the Underground tunnels but also keeps the tallest elements to those parts of the site which benefit from the spacious settings provided by the junctions and the precedent for taller development provided by Apex House. The gap also emphasises and brings focus to the enlarged public realm on High Road.
- 6.92 The frontages of the development are designed in response to the character of each bordering street. A continuous frontage consisting of glazed shop fronts is proposed on the three commercial frontages of the site. The Seven Sisters Road frontage is designed to emphasise the presence of the market and make it a prominent feature of the streetscene. This contrasts with its currently less obvious presence on the High Road. The Suffield Road frontage is of a different scale and character reflecting the residential character of the area in which it is situated.

- 6.93 Above the shops is residential accommodation with the central part of the site providing amenity and play space with servicing underneath. The arrangement of forms around this central amenity space reproduces traditional courtyard development at a larger scale using modern design and modern methods of construction.
- 6.94 The building has a flat roof and it is proposed that the space afforded will be used for photovoltaic (solar panels) equipment in accordance with the energy strategy of the development (see section 'Sustainability and Energy').
- 6.95 The proportions and detail are designed in response to the various street contexts. The flats and shop fronts are designed as terraces of adjoining buildings. The residential storeys are brick faced with stone copings and cills. Window openings reflect the different rooms they light. Projecting oriel windows enhance the modulation of the facades and provide views up and down the street while allowing sunlight into rooms facing north onto West Green Road. Shop fronts are glazed and framed with dark pointed or coated steel sections. Set back upper storeys are proposed to be clad in coated Zinc with glass panels.
- 6.96 The design of the Suffield Road frontage is different in scale and character to the other frontages and comprises a row of family duplex flats with private front doors at street level and two floors of flats above. The design of the facade is modern, as it is not situated in the Conservation Area, with white residential screen walls framing a parapet at the upper level and enclosing a continuous series of private balconies
- 6.97 Contrasting with the verticality and brick emphasis of the three commercial frontages is a frameless glass curved façade which brings focus to the circular public area at the centre of the High Road frontage and relates to the improved entrances proposed for the Underground Station.
- 6.98 Although the design introduces modern elements to the site, it is based on the dominant design characteristics of the area including individual terraces, vertical rhythm of house design, shop fronts and windows, varying window framing and dominant use of brick.
- 6.99 It should be noted that materials proposed at this stage are only indicative and will be subject to further approval through condition should permission be granted. Officers will ensure that materials will be of a quality appropriate to the design and context of the development.
- 6.100 The Design and Access statement sets out the pre-application consultations and exhibitions which took place in July 2007. The applicants also held a series of meetings with interested bodies including the Haringey Council's Design Panel, Community Groups and statutory consultees including English Heritage, the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the Commission for Architecture and the built Environment (CABE).

- 6.101 Following these meetings and the first and second planning consultations, local residents and community groups have objected to the design. Objectors have argued that the design is inappropriate for a conservation area, too high and overbearing, not distinctive and out of keeping with surrounding Victorian and Edwardian development.
- 6.102 In October 2007, the Haringey Design Panel expressed support for the concept of the scheme in plan. However, Panel members also felt that given the site's location within a Conservation Area it was essential to provide a high – quality landmark building for this prominent site. They recommended that the scheme be revisited, and that more positive approach be taken towards an imaginative, high quality, contemporary scheme for the site, with special regard given to the treatment of the junction of the High Road and Seven Sisters Road.
- 6.103 Following meetings and the initial consultation in 2008, CABE commented that they recognise that Wards Corner is a part of the regeneration area and that they are supportive of mixed use development and that they recognise the challenging constraints of the site. They consider that the proposed development has been carefully designed to respond to its specific context and that the design concept is sound.
- 6.104 CABE stated that the lower element on the High Road has been well designed and the proposed design will have a civic presence in relation to public space in front of it. They stated that they appreciated the creation of the public space, which will be well used, and the improvements to the system of tube entrances. They state that they are happy with the single entrance to the raised courtyard, the individual residential entrance covers and the raised garden and circulation systems.
- 6.105 They stated that the Seven Sisters Road buildings have been articulated in an elegant way but consider that the northern block would benefit from a similar simpler treatment. In conclusion they stated “We think that the design has the making of a good scheme and we support this planning application.”
- 6.106 CABE's comments were made in 2008 prior to its dissolution however their comments are still considered relevant and material.
- 6.107 Following discussions in 2008 with GLA Officers and Sir Simon Milton, the GLA design officers agreed that on the basis of further information, clarification and discussion, that the design for the cover building between the High Road frontage and Seven Sisters Road is satisfactory.
- 6.108 Following further discussions the detailed material and treatment of the set-back upper storeys on the Seven Sisters Road frontage was changed. The original proposal showed windows set into a multi-storey metal cladding system reaching the roof. This element of the proposed development was then changed to show alternative windows set flush with opaque glass cladding panels in a regular rhythm of wide and slim panels. This treatment continues up to the roof level and is design to give a contemporary appearance to the duplexes.

- 6.109 This treatment is also used at the same level on the corner of the High Road and West Green Road. This is in response to the comment from CABE which stated that the design of this part of the development should be made simpler and more similar to the Seven Sisters Road frontage of the proposed development
- 6.110 The GLA's updated report makes no further comments the scheme's design however following discussions in 2008 with GLA Officers and Sir Simon Milton and subsequent changes, it is considered that the proposed design has resulted from careful study of the character of the area and the challenging constraints of the site within the context of the terms of the development brief.
- 6.111 Overall it is considered that the proposed design responds to the distinctiveness of the site, the central location and integrity of the street block, the verticality and rhythm of local architecture and predominantly traditional materials in way that uses modern design and modern methods of construction. The design is considered to enhance the conservation area by bringing a landmark development and creating a gateway to Tottenham. The objections from local residents and community groups are noted however it is the opinion of officers that the design meets the requirements of relevant planning policy.
- 6.112 Since 2008 there have been schemes which have been approved by planning committee which proposed modern development along the High Road Conservation Area. These include for example The Tottenham Hotspurs Stadium, 691-693 High Road, 658 High Road, 344 High Road and Tottenham Town Hall. It is considered that the proposed Wards Corner development is consistent with the progress of regeneration through modern development which is occurring on other sites on the High Road.

Public Art

- 6.113 The proposed development contains proposals for improvement of the public realm specifically in relation to existing and extended public areas in front of the proposed new buildings in the High Road. It was originally proposed that a work of public art will be placed at the centre of the proposed pavement circle.
- 6.114 However it is now proposed that a work or works of public art will be incorporated into the fabric of the buildings. The final design features a curved corner block matching the parapet height of its neighbours. On this block is a façade framed in stone with a cast sculpture frieze celebrating the history of the site. Delivery of the public art will be secured through the s106 agreement.

Amenity space

- 6.115 The Council's Housing SPD sets the standard for amenity space under the UDP and the emerging Core Strategy. The SPD would require this development to provide 1010m² of amenity space to meet its standard. The proposed development provides some 1538m² of amenity space within a central courtyard at first floor level overlooked by the surrounding residential units. The

amenity space is laid out as a landscape area on two levels and includes ornamental trees and good cover planting, lawn areas seating and timber decking ramped access to lower gardens and lighting to the main footways. The area also incorporates a children's play space (see section below).

Children's Play Space

- 6.116 The Mayor's London Plan SPG "Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation" provides minimum standards for the provision of children's play space. Using the formulae set out in that SPG the scheme would have a child yield of 36, requiring 360sqm of play space in association with the development. The development includes a dedicated under 5s play space as part of a "Local Playable Area", designed to meet the needs of children aged 0-11. In addition, Brunswick Road playground is within 400m of the application site and provides play space for older children. This level of provision is considered to be in full compliance with the Mayor's play space guidance.
- 6.117 The Council's Open Space and Recreation Standards SPD sets out Haringey's own play space standards under the current UDP and the emerging Core Strategy. Using the formula in that SPD, the expected child yield would be just under 28 children, 8 fewer than that under the GLA's guidance. Haringey's SPD requires 3sqm of play space. Table 1.1 of the SPD states that children's play provision should be provided at 3sqm per child, equal to 84sqm for the whole development, and that Doorstep Playable Space should be at least 100sqm in size within 100m, Local Playable Space should be at least 300sqm within 400m and Neighbourhood Playable space should be at least 500sqm, within 1000m of home.
- 6.118 The scheme is designed to comply with the more onerous standards in the London Plan SPG and exceeds the standards in Haringey's SPD. The site benefits from good access to public open space and sports pitches and meets all the criteria in Table 1.1 of the SPD, apart from being within 500m of an accessible Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, which is the case for the majority of the east of the borough.

Contamination

- 6.119 The applicants have submitted a contamination survey in relation to the proposed development. The survey has identified the possibility of historical sources of ground contamination on the site associated with the present day storage yard and former clothing works. The survey recommends that investigation should be conducted to focus on testing the underlying ground conditions in the south eastern corner of the site. A planning condition concerning this matter has been attached to the recommendation.

Archaeology

- 6.120 The site does not lie in an archaeological priority area. Due to the extent of post ground disturbance it is considered that the proposed development will not have any impact upon any archaeological deposits.

Sustainability and Energy

- 6.121 The London Plan, Draft Replacement London Plan (DRLP) and the Haringey Unitary Development plan require major new development to seek to mitigate and be able to adapt to climate change. Planning policy states that this should be achieved through applying carbon reduction targets to new development and that new development be capable of adapting to climate change through the use of sustainable design and construction e.g. minimising energy use and avoiding overheating and excessive heat generation within the building.
- 6.122 Since the application was originally submitted, Planning Policy regarding energy has changed. Policy 4A.4 Energy Assessment of the London Plan 2008 and Policy 5.2 of the emerging DRLP require development proposals demonstrate the expected energy and carbon dioxide emission savings from the energy efficiency and renewable energy measures incorporated in the development. The assessment should show how these savings were arrived at, having regard to the Mayor's energy hierarchy of:
- Using less energy
 - Using renewable energy; and
 - Supplying energy efficiently

The applicant's submitted energy statement and addendum provide an energy demand assessment for the proposed development in use. The assessment calculates a figure for CO₂ emissions based on a development compliant with Part L Building Regulations 2006. From this baseline figure, the expected energy savings resulting from various measures are compared to give an overall indicator of energy savings and performance.

- 6.123 The development includes reduced U values for external walls, ground floors, roof and windows to reduce heat loss and improved air-tightness. The applicant has demonstrated that these improvements result in all apartments, bar the very worst performing, being likely to pass Part L Building Regulations 2010 through energy efficiency measures alone. In addition, the scheme includes a Combined Heat and Power (CHP) system and photovoltaics (PV). The scheme originally included a dual-fuel boiler system but this was removed following concerns raised by the GLA over its efficiency and air quality impacts.
- 6.124 The proposed energy efficiency measures and renewable energy technology result in a reduction in CO₂ from a Part L 2006 equivalent baseline of 53%. This exceeds the Mayor's carbon reduction target of 44% in the DRLP. The GLA are therefore satisfied with this element of the scheme.
- 6.125 The development will also achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 instead of Level 3, as was originally proposed in 2008.

Traffic and Parking

- 6.126 National Planning Policy seeks to reduce the dependence on the private car in urban areas such as Haringey. The advice in both PPS3 Housing and PPG13 Transport made clear recommendations to this effect. This advice is also reflected in the London Plan. The transport impact of the proposed development has been assessed by the Councils Transport and Highways Group. Policies M2 Public Transport and M3 locating New Development and accessibility of the Unitary Development Plan require that the proposals put forward take into account the needs of public transport users. It is considered that the proposed development is well located in relation to public transport where there is a good level of provision which will result in reduced need for car-use and where travel by other sustainable travel modes can be encouraged.
- 6.127 Policy M4 Pedestrian and Cyclists stated that new development should have a design layout that encourages walking and cycling to the site. In response the proposed development proposes upgrading the public realm on Suffield Road, West Green Road, Seven Sisters Road and the High Road frontages comprising paving, improved lighting and the creation of a new public space which would cater for the increased pedestrian activities expected at this location and ultimately with other schemes in place create a pedestrian friendly environment in this area. In relation to Policy M9 car free developments, Policy M10 Parking for Development and Appendix 1 of the UDP car and cycle parking standards it is considered that the car and cycle provision can be assessed in the context of the criteria for a car free development. This is because the level of public transport accessibility is high in this location and a controlled parking zone exists or will be provided in the future.
- 6.128 Although it is not normal to provide any car parking spaces in a car free development it is considered that the 44 car parking spaces proposed in the basement 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 12 of the houses to be built in Suffield Road, will not be issued with car parking permits for the CPZ.
- 6.129 It is considered 38 cycle spaces (2 per retail unit plus 10 for the market) should be provided for the commercial units. It is considered that the proposed development would not have any significant impact in relation to trip generation over and above existing.
- 6.130 It is considered that the existing public transport infrastructure has sufficient capacity to deal with extra demand created by the proposed development.
- 6.131 The applicants have agreed to submit two travel plans, one for the residential and one for the commercial use. This will be subject of a planning condition should planning permission be granted.
- 6.132 The measures to be included will be the appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator, provision of a welcome induction pack containing public transport, cycling walking information, operation of an on site car club scheme. Adequate cycle provision, travel card/discounted season tickets to first occupiers, travel

information terminals. Where necessary the implementation of the measures discussed will be achieved through the section 106 and section 278 agreements in which case there is no objection to the proposed development by the highway and transportation section of the Council.

- 6.133 The GLA have made no further comments on transport since their initial report of 2008 but have recommended that 20% of parking spaces on-site should have electric charging points and a further 20% should have passive provision for the future. This can be achieved through a condition.

Air Quality

- 6.134 The applicants have submitted an air quality assessment associated with the construction and extra traffic associated within completed development in relation to air quality as requested in PPS 23 Planning and Pollution Control.
- 6.135 The assessment concludes that the extra traffic associated with the development will not significantly affect air quality.
- 6.136 The assessment also concludes that subject to the implementation of a site specific Environmental Management Plan the residential construction air quality impacts will be of limited significance. A condition concerning the submission of an Environmental Management Plan is attached to the recommendation.
- 6.137 The overall traffic increase is not considered significant in terms of air quality. The impact of the development taking into account the improvements in vehicular technology would only be of minor significance.

Community Safety

- 6.138 Crime and fear of crime were identified in the ICM poll as a significant concern for local residents and tackling crime was identified as a priority for many of those surveyed. The Metropolitan Police stated in 2003 when the scheme was first being developed that the site and surrounds suffers from a run-down or unkempt appearance and that this is a factor in attracting crime. Today, the site still suffers from this and it is still considered a contributing factor for local crime and anti-social behaviour.
- 6.139 Since inception, the applicant's have been working with Eric Childs of the Metropolitan Police on the scheme's design. Continuing consultation will occur with the Metropolitan Police in order to achieve 'Secure by Design' certification.
- 6.140 In their consultation response of dated 25 February 2008. The Metropolitan Police stated that they have no objection to the scheme and "look forward to the regeneration of this key gateway into Haringey".
- 6.141 In a letter to the Bridge NDC dated 19 April 2008, the Metropolitan Police confirmed that the development stands up well against principles set out in the Home Office's document "Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention" and in their view will contribute to the ongoing process of reducing

crime around the site.

- 6.142 The scheme was designed with due regard to “Secure by Design” principles. The public square and podium landscaped spaces will be overlooked benefiting from passive surveillance. There will be 24 hour portering / security. An Estate Management Company will be established whose responsibility will be to provide maintenance, refuse collection and control of access and car parking. Residential access to the proposed development will be via the controlled entrance on the High Road with access to each residential block from the podium landscaped area. Vehicle access will be restricted to the gated mews with access from Suffield Road. Access to the residential car park will be limited by a barrier operated by a key given to those entitled to use those spaces.
- 6.143 Regeneration of the site is considered positive as it will counteract the run-down and unkempt appearance identified by the Metropolitan Police, thereby reducing the contribution of this factor to local crime and anti-social behaviour. The scheme is considered to increase community safety.
- 6.144 A condition will be applied requiring compliance with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1, 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and with the aims and objectives of 'Secured By Design' and 'Designing Out Crime'.

Drainage

- 6.145 The majority of the site comprising hard landscaping and therefore the majority of surface water run off will drain into the main water system. The proposed development will use the existing mains drain and sewer system. The capacity of the system will be reviewed and upgraded where necessary.

Noise and Vibration

- 6.146 In accordance with PPG 24: Planning and Noise 1994 the applicants have submitted an Environmental Noise and Vibration assessment for the proposed development including an assessment of the underground train vibration at the site to assess the suitability of the site for residential use. The noise impact of the proposed service road is also assessed. The assessment concludes that provided a suitable glazing specification is adopted for all the properties in the developments, the site is considered suitable for residential and commercial use.
- 6.147 The report concludes that the measured level of train vibration is within acceptable limits and that the predicted noise impact from the service road is acceptable provided the ventilation plant emissions are in accordance with the limited sound pressure level given in the relevant section of the assessment.

Daylight and Sunlight

- 6.148 The applicants have submitted a day light and sunlight assessment in relation to the proposed development based upon Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines Site Layout and Planning for Daylight and Sunlight which

provides the criteria and methodology for calculation in connection with daylight and sunlight.

- 6.149 The report assesses all properties for compliance with the BRE guidelines in relation to daylight, and all relevant properties for sunlight (which is a smaller number because only of those properties with elevations which face with 90 degrees of due South receive sunlight in the UK).
- 6.150 The assessment concludes that retained levels of daylight and sunlight are good and in compliance with the BRE guidelines. The assessment also concludes that there are some sunlight losses in excess of the BRE guidelines to the houses in Suffield Road these are small amounts in real terms and are mainly concentrated on winter sunlight where the existing levels are already below BRE guideline amounts.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

- 6.151 The Local Planning Authority issued a screening opinion on the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment on the 20th June 2007.
- 6.152 The proposed development is “schedule 2 development” within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999, being an urban development project where the area of development exceeds 0.5 hectares. The Local Planning Authority assessed the potential environmental impact of the above development having regard to the selection criteria for screening specified in schedule 3 of the Regulations and the guidance to these regulations set out in Circular 02/99.
- 6.153 Following assessment, the Local Planning Authority determined that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on the environment and that an Environmental Impact Assessment is therefore not required.
- 6.154 Following the Court of Appeal ruling the Local Planning Authority have reconsidered the need for an EIA and have concluded that again an EIA is not required. This is due to the fact that apart from the inclusion of photovoltaic equipment and removal of biomass boiler, the scheme has not changed in any physical way.

Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)

- 6.155 In determining this application the Committee is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. Under the Act, a public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:-
- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

- foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- 6.156 The Council commissioned URS Scott Wilson to conduct an independent Equalities Impact Assessment. Their report dated June 2011 assessed the likely impacts the development would have on the key equalities protected characteristics, age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 6.157 Following an initial screening opinion, race, disability, sex, religion or belief, age and sexual orientation were identified as the protected characteristics which were most likely to be affected. A full assessment was made on this basis and the report is attached at Appendix 4.
- 6.158 The appraisal considered the potential impacts for affected people sharing these protected characteristics arising from the planning application. These impacts are grouped under a number of key inter-related themes identified from the review of policy, the screening findings and the review of baseline evidence and consultation evidence. These themes, their associated recommendations for mitigation and the relevant conditions/s106 responses are summarised in Appendix 3.
- 6.159 The report concludes that overall, the planning application proposal is unlikely to give rise to major negative equality impacts provided all the measures set out in the S106 agreement are honoured in full and in a timely manner. The assessment recognises concerns expressed by objectors concerning potential impacts, particularly in relation to Latin American people and members of other black and minority ethnic groups. In addition to measures previously set out in the S106 agreement and voluntary financial contributions by the developers, the assessment has set out additional recommendations to strengthen previously identified mitigation measures and to address residual negative impacts.
- 6.160 Whilst the non re-provision of affordable housing on the site is considered to give rise to some negative equality impact, the Valuation Office judgment that the development cannot afford affordable housing is considered to justify this negative impact.
- 6.161 The planning application proposal is identified as giving rise to positive equality impacts in relation to safety and crime, accessible public realm and provision of family housing.
- 6.162 In their Stage I report (see Appendix 8), the GLA have referred to the EqIA stating that the provision of the market facilitator and associated package of measures, the re-provision of the market and the provision of local retail in the scheme discharges the obligations of the Council and the GLA under the Equalities Act 2010 provided that the application is conditioned such that the current market cannot be closed until a temporary facility is secured.

6.163 The objection from Planning Aid for London on behalf of the Wards Corner Coalition states that the development will result in increased land rents in the surrounding area. This is said to harm small and micro-businesses, which are more than usually made up of ethnic groups most reliant on incomes from these business, and which make the particular character of West Green Road Town Centre. However, it should be noted that the scheme includes retention of the market, retail units on West Green Road specifically for independent retailers. Furthermore, officers consider that the scheme will bring much needed physical and economic regeneration to the area which will have a positive longer term impact.

Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement

6.164 Under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), the terms of Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, and in line with Policy UD8 and Supplementary Planning Guidance 10a 'The Negotiation, management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations' the Local Planning Authority (LPA) will seek financial contributions towards a range of associated improvements immediately outside the boundary of the site.

Indoor Market

6.165 The indoor market is to be re-provided as shown on the proposed development drawings. On the basis that the applicants undertake to provide a minimum 6 months notice period to the traders for vacant possession and that compensation will be paid to the traders at a rate equivalent to the maximum of that payable under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 and that Urban Space Management and Union Land be employed to assess the opportunities for temporary location for the market as a whole or within an existing market. This re-provision will be subject to four conditions to be contained within the s106 agreements. These conditions are as follows:

- the market must be run by an experienced indoor market operator
- this arrangement must be in place not less than 12 months prior to the practical completion date of the proposed development
- A market lease must be in place not less than 6 months prior to the due practical completion date of the proposed market;
- the rent will be open market rent for A1 use class;

6.166 The Market Operator will also be required to have offered a first right to occupy to all existing traders on an exclusive and non-assignable licence of an equivalent stall in the new market area, on reasonable A1 open market terms.

6.167 The applicant has agreed to provide a minimum notice period of six months to market traders for vacant possession and is offering a compensation payment to assist with relocation expenses. This payment is in the form of £144,000 contribution to a "Trader's Financial Assistance Sum" (an increase on the sum of £96,650 agreed in 2008). The traders do not have any tenancy rights,

therefore this payment is voluntary.

- 6.168 The applicant provides a package (“Market Facilitator Package”) to assist the market to find a temporary location and to continue functioning. This package will run for five years from the granting of consent. This package includes a ‘market facilitator’ to work with traders to identify a temporary location, to work with the Spanish speaking traders to promote their interests in the temporary location and to provide appropriate business support and advice to all traders and businesses to secure the maximum number of expressions of interest to return to the site as well funding towards relocation costs and a three month rent free period in the temporary location. The Market Facilitator will also signpost existing businesses and employees towards existing appropriate bodies to assist business to continue trading or individuals to find suitable alternative employment.

Community Engagement

- 6.169 To further monitor the impact of the scheme and to provide further opportunity for mitigations measures to be considered, the applicant, before development can commence, is to submit to LBH a Community Engagement Strategy for our approval dealing with diversity monitoring and participation measures and seeking further inputs concerning potential impacts of the scheme and suggested additional mitigation measures from different sections of the community. The Strategy should include regular monitoring and reports on the engagement process and how representations received have been taken into account.

Improvements to West Green Road

- 6.170 The applicant offers to contribute £250,000 to a West Green Road Environmental Improvement Fund which will provide:
- shop/building frontage improvements
 - street decoration and enhancements
 - improvements to vehicle servicing
 - Improvement Strategy for business/markets, open space and parking

Affordable Housing

- 6.171 Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing states that a reduced provision of affordable housing can be agreed if full provision would have implications for the scheme’s viability. The Council has commissioned DVS to undertake an assessment of the applicant’s financial appraisal and it was found that the scheme would not be viable if it included affordable housing.

Existing residents and businesses

- 6.172 The Council as Housing Authority shall engage in direct dialogue with secure and non-secure council tenants residing on the site regarding their needs and

choices for re-housing within the local area, where this is their preference.

- 6.173 The Council as Housing Authority shall offer appropriate assistance to shorthold (i.e. private tenants) and owner occupiers to locate to alternative suitable properties
- 6.174 Haringey council shall brief the housing association regarding the scheme's progress to ensure adequate time for them to identify suitable alternative provision for affected tenants.
- 6.175 The developer is to undertake a further round of leaseholder and freeholder engagement prior to a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Resolution being considered by Haringey Cabinet (or such other timeframe as may be agreed by the Council).
- 6.176 The developer shall undertake a baseline study and subsequent ongoing monitoring of the business owners and market holders at key points in the progression of the planning application and construction of the development

Education contribution

- 6.177 In line with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG10c 'Educational Needs Generated by New Housing'. It is appropriate for Local Planning Authorities to seek a financial contribution towards the cost associated with the provision of facilities and services arising from additional demand generated for school places.
- 6.178 In this case the Local Planning Authority recognises that the costs of bringing the scheme forward are exceptional and that the financial appraisal undertaken by DVS demonstrates that the cost of the development is a very high proportion of its value, much greater than would normally be expected for a development to take place. A sum of £200,000 was set aside at the outset in the calculations for Section 106 contributions. The Local Planning Authority accepts that there can be a degree of flexibility in the calculation of the education contribution. As stated in this SPG "each application will be considered on its merits on a case by case basis". The Local Planning Authority therefore accepts a contribution of £200,000 to be reasonable in this case. The NDC had requested that this sum of money be spent on schools within the NDC area.

Public Art

- 6.179 A work or works of public art shall be incorporated into the fabric of the building. The method of selecting an artist to be agreed following the submission of a Public Art Brief.

Public Realm

- 6.180 Proposed works for the Public Realm including enhancement to transport/station entrance improvements will be undertaken and the applicants will enter into a section 278 of the Highways Act Agreement in connection with

the works. Agreement will be reached with the relevant statutory parties and owners in order to carry out the works.

Other elements

6.181 The section 106 agreement will also include provisions for the following:

- Implementation of Travel Plans for key land uses
- Provision of a central energy centre and reduction of CO2 emissions of up to 11% (over Part L 2010)
- Achievement of at least Level 4 under the Code for Sustainable Homes
- Establishment of a management company that will have responsibility (in perpetuity) for the ongoing site management and security.
- Establishment of 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 including a requirement for contractors to adhere to national or local schemes to promote employment amongst under-represented equality groups, e.g. the Disability Two Ticks scheme
- Provision of Podium Gardens and Open Space
- Provision and maintenance of Podium Garden and Play space
- No entitlement for occupiers to residents parking permits (except for 12 permits for houses in Suffield Road)
- Contribution of £1000 towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order (TMO)
- Implementation of Lifetime Homes Standards and 10% wheelchair access (20 flats)
- Letting/marketing strategy for residential units
- Waste Management and Recycling
- A cost recovery charge of 3% of the total value of the s106

6.182 Following the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010 Regulations (as amended) coming into force 06 April 2010, the three tests on the use of planning obligations in Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations were placed into law. The three tests are that planning obligations must be:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

It is considered that the above s106 contributions are necessary, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development therefore meeting the above three tests.

7. HUMAN RIGHTS

- 7.1 All applications are considered against a background of the Human Rights Act 1998 and in accordance with Article 22(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003 there is a requirement to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. Reasons always have to be given where planning permission is refused. These reasons are always set out on the decision notice. Unless any report specifically indicates otherwise all decisions of this Committee will accord with the requirements of the above Act and Order.

8. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

- 8.1 Following the adoption of the Wards Corner Development Brief in January 2004 (see section 'Development Brief'), Grainger Trust was selected as a development partner to deliver regeneration for the area covered by the brief. In November 2005 the Council entered into a development agreement with Grainger. The objective of the agreement is to secure a quality redevelopment of the site which promotes the regeneration objectives for the area.
- 8.2 Part of the agreement states that all affordable housing referable (whether by public policy or otherwise) to the development is to be discharged by off-site provision procured by and at the cost of the Council or a third party. It also states that the Council will make available its site at Apex House (and/or another suitable site or sites within the Borough) for the provision of all affordable housing referable to the development and will satisfy any requirement to procure affordable housing referable to the development at its own cost so as to enable the Development to be implemented in accordance with the agreement.
- 8.3 Officers are satisfied that due to the expense of developing the site and the associated implications for viability (see section 'Viability'), there is no affordable housing referable to the development by planning policy. Therefore the provision of affordable Housing at Apex House and/or another suitable site or sites within the Borough is not required.
- 8.4 Notwithstanding the above, the lack of affordable housing provision at Apex House and other matters relating to the development agreement are matters external to the planning application currently under consideration.

9. PREDETERMINATION

- 9.1 The Council is in a development agreement (see preceding section 'Development Agreement') and owns part of the application site. These facts are not planning considerations and Members must not consider the Council as development partner or land owner when reaching their decision.

10. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 10.1 The detailed assessments outlined in this report demonstrate that there is strong planning policy support for the development embodied in the Local Development Plan and supported by National Planning Guidance.
- 10.2 Prior to and during the life of the application, the council and the applicants have engaged with key stake holders (local businesses, residents, community groups including the WCC, members and statutory agencies) to develop a scheme which addresses local issues while delivering major regeneration.
- 10.3 The application was originally approved in December 2008 however the planning consent was quashed in June 2010 by the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal considered that the Planning Committee had not fully discharged its duty under section 71 of the Race Relations Act, 1976 in that it did not have due regard to “the need to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between persons of different of different racial groups”. Following this decision the application is now being re-determined. Physically, the scheme is mostly unchanged however a modified s106 agreement is proposed.
- 10.4 In re-determining the application, officers had regard to the Council’s obligations under the Equality Act 2010. An independent Equalities Impact Assessment was undertaken by URS Scott Wilson and it was found that the proposal is unlikely to give rise to major negative equality impacts provided all the measures set out in the s106 agreement are honoured in full and in a timely manner.
- 10.5 The application site is located on the west side of Tottenham High Road and comprises 227 to 259 High Road, 709 – 723 Seven Sisters Road, 1a – 11 West Green Road and 8 – 30 Suffield Road. It is a prominent site containing the former Wards Corner Department Store and is located above Seven Sisters Underground Station and tunnels. The site currently occupied by retail and commercial uses with residential above in some parts. Suffield Road is entirely residential. The site is identified in planning policy and the planning brief as a key regeneration site.
- 10.6 The application proposes the demolition of all buildings on site and the erection of a modern mixed use development with retail on the ground floor of the Seven Sisters, High Road and West Green Road frontages and flats on the upper floors. Development on Suffield Road will be completely residential with each dwelling having separate street access.
- 10.7 The development is considered to deliver regeneration sought by planning policy and the development brief. It will deliver new quality retail space, including new accommodation for the Seven Sisters Market (following their temporary relocation facilitated by the developer); a large number of new dwellings built to modern standards including the provision of family housing; quality amenity space and children’s play space; improvements to the public realm including a new public square and improvements to West Green Road.

- 10.8 The development is a high quality modern design which takes cues from the surrounding Victorian and Edwardian Development but also capitalises on the distinctiveness of the location to create a landmark gateway development. It will be built to high environmental performance standards with the inclusion of CHP and solar panel technology. The site's excellent access to public transport allows for a high density development with no harm to public and private transport networks. Redevelopment of the area will improve community safety by improving the public realm and overcoming negative perceptions.
- 10.9 The applicant has robustly demonstrated that the provision of affordable housing would make the scheme unviable. This same conclusion was reached by DVS following their own independent financial appraisal of the scheme. Although no affordable housing is proposed, a significant number of affordable housing units are proposed elsewhere in the east of the borough.
- 10.10 The development will involve the loss of identified Heritage Assets through the demolition of buildings in a Conservation Area, some of which are locally listed. The applicant has demonstrated that retaining these buildings while delivering the benefits of the proposed scheme would not be viable. The harm caused by the loss of these Heritage Assets is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits delivered by the scheme.
- 10.11 The applicant has engaged directly with existing residents and business on site, particularly the market traders, and has proposed a package of measures to compensate for their inevitable displacement. These measures were proposed following input from the affected residents and traders as well as the recommendations in the Equalities Impact Assessment and those from the GLA. Implementation of these measures will be secured through a s106 agreement.
- 10.12 On balance it is the officers' view that the scheme is largely consistent with planning policy and that subject to appropriate conditions and s106 contributions the application should be approved.

11. RECOMMENDATION 1

That planning permission be granted in accordance with planning application reference number HGY/2008/0303 subject to a pre-condition that the applicant shall first have entered into an agreement or agreements with Council (under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990(as amended) in order to secure:

Indoor Market

A space suitable for the re provision of the indoor market shall be provided in the development as shown on the approved drawings subject to the following conditions:

- The market is replaced , almost like for like in space terms on the Seven Sisters Road frontage;
- The market is run by an experienced indoor market operator;
- This arrangement must be in place not less than 12 months prior to the practical completion date of the proposed development;
- A market lease must be in place not less than 6 months prior to the due practical completion date of the proposed market;
- The rent must be reasonable open market rent for A1 use class;
- Compensation will be paid to traders at a rate equivalent to the maximum of that payable under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954;
- A first right-to-occupy shall be offered to all existing traders on an exclusive and non-assignable license of an equivalent stall in the new market area, on reasonable a1 open market terms;

Temporary Market Relocation

- The applicant provides a package (“Market Facilitator Package”) to assist the market to find a temporary location and to continue functioning. This package will run for five years from the granting of consent. This package includes a ‘market facilitator’ to work with traders to identify a temporary location, to work with the Spanish speaking traders to promote their interests in the temporary location and to provide appropriate business support and advice to all traders to secure the maximum number of expressions of interest to return to the site as well funding towards relocation costs and a three month rent free period in the temporary location. The Market Facilitator will also signpost existing businesses and employees towards existing appropriate bodies to assist business to continue trading or individuals to find suitable alternative employment.
- The applicant provides a minimum notice period of six months to market traders for vacant possession and is offering a compensation payment to assist with relocation expenses. This payment is in the form of £144,000 contribution to a “Trader’s Financial Assistance Sum” (an increase on the sum of £96,650 agreed in 2008). The traders do not have any tenancy rights, therefore this payment is voluntary

Existing residents and businesses

- The Council as Housing Authority shall engage in direct dialogue with secure and non-secure council tenants residing on the site regarding their needs and choices for re-housing within the local area, where this is their preference.
- The Council as Housing Authority shall offer appropriate assistance to shorthold (i.e. private tenants) and owner occupiers to locate to alternative suitable

properties

- Haringey council shall brief the housing association regarding the scheme's progress to ensure adequate time for them to identify suitable alternative provision for affected tenants.
- The developer is to undertake a further round of leaseholder and freeholder engagement prior to a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) Resolution being considered by Haringey Cabinet (or such other timeframe as may be agreed by the Council)
- The developer shall undertake a baseline study and subsequent ongoing monitoring of the business owners and market holders at key points in the progression of the planning application and construction of the development

Community Engagement

To further monitor the impact of the scheme and to provide further opportunity for mitigations measures to be considered, the applicant, before development can commence, is to submit to LBH a Community Engagement Strategy for our approval dealing with diversity monitoring and participation measures and seeking further inputs concerning potential impacts of the scheme and suggested additional mitigation measures from different sections of the community. The Strategy should include regular monitoring and reports on the engagement process and how representations received have been taken into account.

West Green Road Improvement Fund

A contribution of £250,000 shall be made to a West Green Road Environmental Improvement Fund which will provide:

- shop/building frontage improvements
- street decoration and enhancements
- improvements to vehicle servicing
- Improvement Strategy for business/markets, open space and parking

Education Contribution

- The Local Planning Authority requires a contribution of £200,000.

Public Art

- A work or works of public art shall be incorporated into the fabric of the building. The method of selecting an artist to be agreed following the submission of a Public Art Brief.

Public Realm

- The proposed works for the Public Realm including enhancement to transport/station entrance improvements shall be undertaken and the applicants will enter into a section 278 of the Highways Act Agreement in connection with the works. Agreement shall be reached with the relevant statutory parties and owners in order to carry out the works.

Other elements

- Implementation of Travel Plans for key land uses
- Provision of a central energy centre and reduction of CO2 emissions of up to 6%
- Achievement of at least Level 4 under the Code for Sustainable Homes
- Establishment of a management company that will have responsibility (in perpetuity) for the ongoing site management and security.
- Establishment of 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 including a requirement for contractors to adhere to national or local schemes to promote employment amongst under-represented equality groups, e.g. the Disability Two Ticks scheme
- Provision of Podium Gardens and Open Space
- Provision and maintenance of Podium Garden and Play space
- No entitlement for occupiers to residents parking permits (except for 12 permits for houses in Suffield Road)
- Contribution of £1000 towards the amendment of the Traffic Management Order (TMO)
- Implementation of Lifetime Homes Standards and 10% wheelchair access (20 flats)
- Letting/marketing strategy for residential units
- Waste Management and Recycling
- A cost recovery charge of 3% of the total value of the s106

12. RECOMMENDATION 2

- (1) That, following completion of the agreement referred to in resolution
- (2) Planning permission be granted in accordance with the planning application subject to direction of the GLA.

GRANT PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2008/0303

Applicant's 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, including statement addenda.

Pollard Thames Edwards Architects January 2008.

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

13. REASONS FOR APPROVAL

13.1 The proposed development of the site for a mixed use development comprising retail shops, 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.

13.2 Conditions

Implementation

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.

Materials

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 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.

Hours of Construction

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.

Waste storage and recycling

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.

Disabled Access

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.

Shopfront Design

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.

Secured by Design

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'.

Parking and Loading/unloading

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 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 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.

Satellite Aerials

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 / ariel 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.

Drainage

13. 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.

Landscape/playspace Management

14. 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.

Environmental Management Plan/Air Quality Assessment

15. 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.

Lifetime Homes

16. 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.

17. 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.

Noise

18. 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

19. 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.

Cycle Parking

20. 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.

Commercial Opening Hours

21. 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.

Travel Plans

22. 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 Local Planning Authority.

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

Construction Traffic

23. That details of the routing 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.

Climate Change Mitigation

24. 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 6%.

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

25. The applicant shall implement energy efficiency measures for the residential to comply with Part L of 2010 Building Regulations.

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

Public Realm Improvements

26. 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.

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.

Energy Modelling

27. 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.

Demolition Management Plan

28. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a demolition management plan detailing the method of demolition, all construction vehicle activity related to demolition works, noise, dust and vibration mitigation measures and suitable measures to enhance the external appearance of the site, including appropriate additional lighting, associated with the development hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Reason: To protect the existing amenity of the surrounding area.

Photovoltaics

29. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, details and drawings of the proposed photovoltaic equipment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved prior to commencement of works. Such approved scheme shall be implemented and permanently retained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development meets the appropriate design and sustainability standards as required by 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.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Consultation responses

Appendix 2: Planning Policies

Appendix 3: Summary of Equalities Impacts and Recommendations by URS Scott Wilson and conditions/s106 provisions in response

Appendix 4: Equalities Impact Assessment prepared by URS Scott Wilson

Appendix 5: Executive Summary of Toolkit Analysis by DVS

Appendix 6: Development Management Forum Minutes

Appendix 7: Summary of GLA reports

Appendix 8: GLA reports

Appendix 9: Court of Appeal judgement

Appendix 10: Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief

APPENDIX 1

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
1	Wards Corner Coalition (WCC)	<p><i>Letter dated 20 June 2011</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Grainger plan would displace many people and business. The market will not be saved but priced out 2. The surrounding independent business have not been considered in the Grainger plan 3. The scheme does not provide 'affordable housing' 4. The much loved, locally listed and iconic Edwardian building would be demolished. 5. There would be massive piling works over the Victoria line and escalators 6. It is remit of councillors to protect the electorate from this sort of development 7. It is well documented that such developments take money out of an area and harm small local business 8. It is important to restore what remains of our heritage 9. We do not want new building replacing treasured iconic old buildings 10. We would like a high-end restoration of the main Wards 	<p>Conditions and s106 obligations will be in place to ensure support for the Latin American Market and appropriate support for displaced residential and commercial occupiers</p> <p>West Green Town Centre is a wholly independent centre. The scheme provides s106 contributions for Town Centre improvement and will compliment the centre with new multiples and market space</p> <p>The scheme will provide a substantial number of new homes (197 total) to replace the existing affordable and private housing. The viability assessment demonstrates that provision of affordable housing is not viable. The overall regeneration of site outweighs need for affordable housing.</p> <p>The building has been assessed for statutory listing and has not been approved. The design of the new scheme provides a new landmark building and opportunity for a purpose built market</p> <p>This is a Building Control issue</p> <p>The 2006 UDP and Development Brief were all consulted on and they support in principle a scheme as proposed</p> <p>See answer to 2 above</p> <p>The design of the scheme is addressed in the report</p> <p>See answer to 4 above</p> <p>The council has met with and supports the WCC to submit their</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Corner building with a more modest, phased, imaginative restoration of the rest of the site. The Prince's Trust is in support of this approach and has already offered suggestions for its funding, which have been ignored by the council.</p> <p>11. There needs to be shift from a centrally devised plan to more organic growth. There are vibrant businesses on site despite Council neglect</p> <p><i>Letter dated May 2011 by Planning Aid for London on behalf of WCC</i></p> <p>12. Although previously approved at committee, this committee is not bound by this decision.</p> <p>13. There still remains a likelihood that the scheme could lead to permanent loss of the market. This is due to lack of clarity market and lease particulars</p> <p>14. There will be insufficient provision made for the 12 independent traders and small businesses in the proposed shops</p> <p>15. The market will disappear and the retention of the market in the new scheme is not enforceable. Development should reflect neighbourhood function of the town centre.</p> <p>16. The Wards Corner building has historical resonance and should be retained. The scheme fails the tests of PPS5.</p> <p>17. The report should mention the impact on rising land rents for small and micro-businesses in the area. This will increase the cost of business more than usually made up ethnic groups</p>	<p>own application. The Council is open to approaches from any organisation.</p> <p>See answer to 6. The scheme does not preclude such uses being developed and provided.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>All reasonable endeavours will be undertaken to ensure a temporary location for the market is found prior to its closure at Wards Corner. The market will be managed by a experienced market operator. Further details are provided in the report.</p> <p>The units on West Green Road are for small independent retailers. Those who move elsewhere will receive business advice if doing so.</p> <p>The conditions and s106 will help to ensure survival of the market. Any subsequent change to the market would require consent. The scheme includes space market traders and small retailers to facilitate neighbourhood retail function</p> <p>The report shows that the scheme passes PPS5 and provides a quality designed replacement building.</p> <p>This is addressed in the report see para. 6.163</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>18. The proposal conflicts with policies supporting inclusive communities and vitality of town centres.</p> <p><i>Email dated 09 November 2008</i></p> <p>19. Plans are unpopular with local traders and residents</p> <p>20. Despite received substantial funds, the scheme will not bring public benefit</p> <p>21. Scheme will result in fewer jobs</p> <p>22. No evidence that developers can bring new or different retail/restaurants</p> <p>23. Does not brief requirement for vital, mixed use, taking its cue from local diversity</p> <p>24. Will attract a transient population. Does not meet social housing need</p> <p>25. Design is out keeping and scale with area</p> <p>26. The plan involves the demolition of well-loved and well-regarded heritage buildings in a conservation area</p> <p>27. The plan will prevent the development of a proposed vibrant multicultural and Iberian and Latin quarter</p> <p>28. The scheme is not deliverable</p> <p>29. There is a viable and locally supported alternative proposal led by local people and the Wards Corner</p>	<p>The scheme is consistent with relevant UDP and London Plan Policy (3A.17, 3A.18, 3D.1, 3D.2, 3D.3, 4B.5, 4B.8 of London Plan and G5, AC3, AC4, TCR1, TCR3 of UDP)</p> <p>Scheme has been designed following extensive consultation but it must be assessed against planning and regeneration policy and the Planning Brief.</p> <p>Scheme will provide extensive public benefits. Please see report para. 6.19-6.30</p> <p>The scheme will provide more retail space and associated increase in employment potential. Construction will use local labour according to s106 agreement</p> <p>Scheme has variety of retail units. There will be a letting strategy focussing on independent retailers</p> <p>See answer to 22</p> <p>See answer to 3</p> <p>Design is addressed in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p> <p>Conservation is addressed in the report para. 6.65-6.79</p> <p>The scheme does not preclude the creation of a Iberian and Latin quarter</p> <p>The District Valuer Services (DVS) appraisal concludes the scheme is deliverable</p> <p>See answer to 10</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Community Coalition</p> <p><i>Letter dated 03 March 2008</i></p> <p>30. The scheme is not consistent with the Brief</p> <p>31. Destruction of Tottenham's built heritage and detriment to conservation area</p> <p>32. Misrepresentative and partial publicity by Grainger and their communications company M&N</p> <p>33. Negative impact on diverse ethnic communities</p> <p>34. Destruction of market</p> <p>35. External retail development will distort local economy and character away from sustainability</p> <p>36. Negative impact on risk of crime and perception of crime</p> <p>37. Destruction of existing business, homes and the market</p> <p>38. Unacceptable housing density, tenure and design</p> <p>39. Unethical subsidy of private profit with public funds through NDC</p> <p>A letter and DVD were received on behalf of the Wards Corner Community Coalition dated 8th July 2008 proposing deferral of planning applications and the establishment of a steering committee.</p> <p><i>Further objection received 11 July 2011</i></p>	<p>The scheme is considered consistent, see all of report.</p> <p>Conservation and Design addressed in report para. 6.65-6.112</p> <p>Not a planning issue. The council has engaged widely and openly</p> <p>See Equalities section in report para. 6.155-6.163</p> <p>See answer to 13</p> <p>Improved variety of retail and accommodation of market and small retailers will provide sustainable retail</p> <p>See Community Safety section in report para. 6.138-6.144</p> <p>Those displaced will receive appropriate assistance. The market will be relocated temporarily and re-provided in the new scheme. See report para. 6.165-6.168.</p> <p>Density and design in compliance with policy. Affordable housing is not viable. See report para. 6.51-6.53, 6.80-6.112, 6.54-6.56</p> <p>Not a planning matter</p> <p>The council have and continue to support community members in the preparation and submission of a refurbishment scheme</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>40. Equalities and discriminatory destruction of ethnic minority businesses and social amenity</p> <p>41. Place making and heritage – scheme is contrary to PPS5. The Princes Regeneration Trust are prepared to find funding for preservation and refurbishment. Public opinion is against the development.</p> <p>42. Failure to meet housing obligations. No provision of affordable housing at Apex House.</p> <p>43. Deficits in sustainable environment obligations</p> <p>44. Destruction of jobs and local economic activity – the scheme is contrary to PPS4</p> <p>45. Crime myths</p>	<p>See answer 33</p> <p>See Conservation section in report 6.80-6.112 and following sections on local residents consultations</p> <p>See para 6.60</p> <p>See para 6.122 to 6.126</p> <p>The scheme will provide a variety of retail units. See para 6.20-6.47</p> <p>See para 6.139-6.145</p>
2	<p>Local Residents - First consultation beginning Feb 2008</p> <p>365 responses (incl 23 duplicates) in objection</p> <p>27 responses in support</p>	<p>Residents and traders will lose homes and livelihoods.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The market would be lost. 2. The iconic Wards Corner building and other Edwardian buildings would be lost. These building should be restored. 3. The development proposed by Grainger has not benefited from widespread and meaningful consultation with the Community. 4. Flats and shopping mall does not constitute imaginative landmark gateway 5. Development is of a mechanical nature rather than human nature thus not one for which it's users or 	<p>Conditions and s106 obligations will be in place to ensure support and re-provision of the Latin American Market and appropriate support for displaced residential and commercial occupiers</p> <p>See answer 1</p> <p>Design and conservation issues addressed in report para 6.65-6.112</p> <p>Both Grainger and the Council have consulted widely and openly prior and during the life of the application</p> <p>The building is a quality landmark design, see report para. 6.80-6.112.</p> <p>See answer 5</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>inhabitants are likely to feel a sense of ownership</p> <p>6. It would constitute a gated private community which will be severed from and have no sense of identity or involvement with the rest of the Seven Sisters Area</p> <p>7. Seven story blocks will not be in harmony with the adjacent Page Green Conservation Area,</p> <p>8. The health, Education, Recreation and Transport infrastructure is not sufficient to cater for the new inhabitants,</p> <p>9. The development will displace local businesses in favour of branches of chain stores</p> <p>10. The development offers no new open space for public recreation and relaxation</p> <p>11. The proposal has been drawn up without involvement from the public and without consultation with local businesses and the people who will be affected by it.</p>	<p>The development is integrated into the public realm and will provide spaces for local business to operate</p> <p>The building varies in height and is sensitive to local development, see report.</p> <p>See relevant sections in report para. 6.177-6.178, 6.115-6.118, 6.126-6.133</p> <p>Scheme has variety of retail units. There will be a letting strategy focussing on independent retailers</p> <p>The scheme introduces a new public square</p> <p>See answer 4</p>
3	<p>Local Residents - Second consultation beginning Jan 2011</p> <p>624 responses (549 in standard letter form)</p> <p>11 responses in support</p>	<p>The objector's comments were along similar lines as those raised in the previous consultation period however the following points are new or were further emphasised:</p> <p>1. Inadequate consultation, second round of consultation was not clear, images should have been included, comment button on website did not work</p> <p>2. Loss of existing diverse and vibrant shops would be harmful to the local community and business. Following requirements of Equalities legislation, mitigation measures should be included to minimise impact on traders, including temporary accommodation and affordable rents</p>	<p>Both Grainger and the Council have consulted widely and openly prior and during the life of the application</p> <p>Conditions and s106 obligations will mitigate equalities impacts</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		3. The new market is not adequate to re-house the existing market in its entirety	The market is large enough to accommodate all existing traders
		4. Essential surrounding local businesses will be lost. Current economic conditions make it unlikely that the scheme will be successful. The retail units will fail and displaced business will be unable to carry on elsewhere	The variety of retail units, including the market, and particular dedicated units on West Green Road will promote independent retailers. A Letting Strategy will support this
		5. The design is inferior, does not enhance conservation area and does create a sense of place	Design and conservation is addressed in the report para. 6.65-6.112
		6. Existing heritage buildings should be restored. They are friendly to small business	Conservation is addressed in the report. Proposed retail provision will accommodate small business
		7. The development is not capable of sustainable use.	The development is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable due to low energy use, re-provision of local market and creation of jobs for example
		8. The Grainger development has not benefited from widespread and meaningful consultation	Regeneration of Wards Corner has been subject to consultation since inception. The Grainger scheme is product of this process
		9. The development will not create a sustainable town centre	See answer 7
		10. The applicant's Equalities Impact Assessment is questionable. It is a desktop study that does not contain primary research. The council is required to undertake a EqIA	The Council has commissioned an independent Equalities Impact Assessment. See appendix 5.
		11. The new market will not be suitable for all traders to return, particularly food retailers and provides no provision for temporary relocation	The market will accommodate existing uses. Conditions and s106 will provide a temporary relocation for the market.
		12. Crime and fear of crime are overstated in an effort to exaggerate the benefits of the scheme	Crime and fear of crime is identified issue and the scheme will improve community safety but will have other benefits as well.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		13. The scheme provides no community benefit or public open space to Tottenham	The scheme provides a new public square, improved public realm, new quality housing and retail
		14. The Toolkit assessment should be made public	An executive summary is publicly available
		15. If consent is granted, conditions should be applied requiring rapid development, restrictions on sale of the land and permission	Not a planning matter but the development agreement in place requires Grainger to development the site to completion in a timely manner and restricts their ability assign or dispose of their rights or obligations under the DA without consent from the Council
		16. The benefits of dual fuel boilers using biofuels are overstated The development will not achieve 20% renewable energy. Photovoltaics are viable with feed-in tariffs.	Agreed. The scheme will now include photovoltaics rather than a dual-fuel boiler.
		17. The LED artwork is energy intensive. No comparison has been made between the embedded carbon emissions of the scheme and refurbishment proposal	The scheme has been subjected to an energy assessment and meets London Plan Climate change mitigation policies
		18. The development and development process go against the spirit of the emerging Localism bill	Local stakeholders have been involved since inception of development brief.
		19. The scheme is even less viable today and the site will remain undeveloped for longer, causing blight	The independent financial appraisal concludes the scheme is deliverable
		20. There is a more appropriate community-led alternative scheme	Approval of this scheme does not preclude other schemes coming forward
		21. Haringey council should back the community, not private interests. The community proposals have been ignored.	The council have supported and continue to support community members in the preparation and submission of a scheme for the refurbishment of Wards Corner.
		22. The scheme still does not help solve the housing shortage	It has been demonstrated that affordable housing is not viable on this site
		23. No guarantee that new retail facilities will be what local	The variety of retail units, including the market, and particular

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>people want.</p> <p>24. Will be destructive to community relations and cohesiveness</p> <p>25. Redevelopment should be sympathetic to the locality and not driven by profit</p> <p>26. Preserving local character will lead to longer term regeneration</p> <p>27. The applicants and council have not responded to the judgement of the Court of Appeal</p> <p>28. New notices has not been given to landowners</p>	<p>those on West Green Road will promote independent retailers. A Letting Strategy will support this</p> <p>Conditions and s106 obligations will help to minimise impacts of disruption and displacement for residents and retailers and encourage retailers to return to the site</p> <p>The scheme is designed sympathetically to local architecture. The scheme is driven by a desire to regenerate the Seven Sisters area</p> <p>The development makes use of the site to transform and bring investment into the are while retaining the market, independent retail and sympathetic design</p> <p>The council have paid close attention to equalities duties and have commissioned and independent equalities impact assessment</p> <p>Same scheme with same reference number is being reassessed. No need to serve new notices</p>
4	Cllr David Schmitz	<p>Cllr Schmitz's objection refers to legal points regarding the conduct of the committee. However, those which relate to the planning merits of the scheme are summarised here</p> <p>1. The site is not a major town centre location. The market and wards corner building provides the attraction of this small town centre in a way a modern development would not. The market and small independent shops are more resilient to economic conditions</p> <p>2. The applicant's heritage assessment is self-serving</p>	<p>The development will provide a variety of retail spaces to provide a varied and robust retail offer complementing the existing town centre.</p> <p>See conservation section in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>3. The applicant's planning statement addendum misquotes the brief, downplaying the importance of retaining the Wards Corner building.</p> <p>4. The proposed wording to the market lease clause does not compel the developer and market operator to agree anything</p> <p>5. The replacement market will command higher rents than the existing market and will price out existing traders</p> <p>6. The EqlA on the Council's website was undertaken by the applicant. It should have had a wider geographic scope. It does not account for the impact on people who use the market.</p> <p>7. The loss of the market and shops will deprive a substantial community of their way up out of deprivation.</p> <p>8. The suggestion that the development will reduce the fear of crime is unfounded</p> <p>9. The applicant has not justified why high rise development is so beneficial to justify demolition of Ward Corner</p> <p>10. There is no evidence that the Wards Corner building must be demolished because there is no tenancy demand. The Council or NDC have made no attempt to attract a tenant</p>	<p>The scheme is considered to be consistent with the development brief</p> <p>The s106 wording has not been finalised but it will be drafted to ensure that recommendations of the EqlA and GLA are honoured.</p> <p>Improvement of market premises and associated increase in rent would also occur with a refurbishment scheme. The difference in rent with a demolition and rebuild is not considered to be significant</p> <p>The Council has commissioned URS Scott Wilson to prepare an independent EqlA and this is publicly available. The 'Wards Corner LSOA' is used to create an equality profile for an area most closely associated to the site. Section 7.4 of the URS Scott Wilson EqlA addresses the impact on those use the market.</p> <p>The market will be offered a temporary location to continue operating. Shops will received business advice.</p> <p>The Met Police have confirmed that improvements to the appearance of an area reduce crime and fear of crime</p> <p>High rise development is appropriate to the site and allows for the delivery of a substantial number of new housing units. See design and regenerations sections of the report para. 6.80-6.112, 6.19-6.30.</p> <p>The Wards Corner building is owned by Transport for London. Tenancy is out of the Council's or Grainger's control.</p>
5	David Lammy MP	<p>Letter received during initial consideration of application.</p> <p>1. Concern expressed over poor initial consultation, lack of early resident and business involvement, design, mix of retail, concerns of market traders.</p>	<p>Scheme has been subject open and wide consultation. Other issues mention are addressed in the report.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>2. Doubts remain over deliverability of WCC plans.</p> <p>3. Fear is that any regeneration will be stalled, leaving the area blighted.</p>	<p>The council have and continue to support the WCC to prepare and submit their plan</p> <p>Regeneration of Wards Corner is a Council priority</p>
6	Tottenham Civic Society Contact: Matthew Bradby	<p>1. The structures proposed do not represent an integrated approach to design that takes account of their historic, social or cultural context. The architects claim that the blocks will 'reference the past' through their large windows and terracotta panels, but this would not alter the essential fact that they are little more than blocks of high density flats that represent a radical departure from the three storey brick built shops and homes that characterise the area at present and which are the main reason that it is a conservation area.</p> <p>2. The main tower blocks are described as being of up to seven storeys but as they sit on a two storey base, I think this makes them nine storeys tall. This will fundamentally and irrevocably disrupt the scale and character of the conservation area in which Ward's Corner stands and the adjacent Page Green Conservation Area. As the blocks do not have any setting or ground around them, they appear crowded and far too large for the space available according to normal ideas of scale.</p> <p>3. The proposals fail on CSV1: 'the Council will require that developments in conservation areas preserve or enhance the historic character and qualities of the buildings and/or the conservation area'. I think that the main blocks succeed in embodying the worst failings of early twentieth century architecture in that they are simultaneously hugely out of scale and fiddly and fussy at the same time. The quality of the architecture and ideas is simply not strong enough to justify demolishing what</p>	<p>Design is addressed in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p> <p>Buildings are maximum 7 storeys tall. See answer 1</p> <p>Conservation, heritage and design is addressed in report para. 6.65-6.112.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>we have in place. There are a few things that I do like, but they are mainly to do with landscaping around the large plane tree and station entrance which do not require demolition of the existing buildings.</p> <p>Residential concerns</p> <p>4. We are not confident in the argument that the residential units will attract more affluent people to the area. We think it is questionable whether these affluent people will wish to buy homes with balconies overlooking a very busy intersection where according to the application twelve bus routes converge on a road 'disfigured by heavy traffic'. The level of noise, as well as exhaust fumes, will be such that nobody will be able to use those balconies. The design simply won't work. It seems more likely that the flats will be acquired by investors and used as buy-to-let properties, resulting in more transient residents with little sense of belonging or connection with the area.</p> <p>5. We are very concerned that if the proposed development does not incorporate some affordable housing, it will fail to meet the Council's own published targets on providing integrated housing solutions that combine private and shared ownership schemes. It seems to us that this type of development is the most desirable in preventing social exclusion and social barriers between residents.</p> <p>6. Looking at the local map, the closest real open space is Markfield Park, some ten minutes walk away on the other side of a busy junction in this, the densest and most built up part of the whole of Tottenham. There could be a large number of children in 200 flats, and this seems a very constrained environment for them. I know that road improvements are planned for the area, but I doubt whether the volume of traffic passing the development will really be reduced.</p>	<p>The new homes are designed and will be built to high quality standards to attract owner occupiers</p> <p>It has been robustly demonstrated that affordable housing is not viable on this site</p> <p>Child playspace is addressed in the report para. 6.116-6.118.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Retail concerns</p> <p>7. We believe that the level of rents likely to be demanded by the developer in order to meet their profit targets will result in a very undesirable mix of retail outlets, likely to be characterised by low cost licensed premises, betting, money transfer/lending shops and fast food. These are exactly the types of highly profitable chains which have moved into new developments at Wood Green station - e.g. Wetherspoons, McDonalds, Yates Wine Lodge, Shout, and at Turnpike Lane, and it seems likely that similar chains would want to site themselves at Seven Sisters, particularly given match day trade.</p> <p>8. There seems to be confusion about how the development may or may not affect crime in the area but I think the proposed development carries major risks in this respect. Given the presence of Tesco across the road, some people's hopes that we will see a Sainsbury's Local, Costa Coffee, M&S, Next, etc, are overconfident and unjustified. I think given the high likelihood of the arrival of licensed premises to the development, we could well see a very negative effect on crime. It would be very difficult for the Council to block licensed premises from taking leases in a new development and all hopes for what shops might be attracted are purely speculative.</p> <p>9. Whether or not the units are let, the removal of the independent and popular cafes that colonise the pavement at present may lead to the area reverting to being a crime hotspot. If this were to happen, the negative effect on the retail premises and surrounding area would be contrary to the whole spirit and aspiration of the redevelopment. It would be far better to create more small retail spaces in the tradition of the existing vibrant Latin market, which will generate more self-employment. This is the kind of regeneration that has worked very well, in Camden for example, which has</p>	<p>The variety of retail units, including the market, and particular those on West Green Road will promote independent retailers. A Letting Strategy will support this</p> <p>Community Safety is addressed in the report para 6.138-6.144.</p> <p>The scheme will include space for small independent retailers and market traders</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>embraced its Victorian heritage.</p> <p>Seven Sisters Underground Station</p> <p>10. We are not reassured by the developer's statements on the effect on the station. Disruption to the station, on the Victoria Line, could be nothing short of catastrophic, given the importance of this line to the entire capital. We have seen maps of the position of the tunnels and station and I understand that the ticket hall is only 1m (one metre) below street level. The application also concedes that escalators are 'especially sensitive to movement'. We disagree that comprehensive redevelopment is a good solution to the construction difficulties. Surely leaving existing buildings intact is a more reliable means of reducing risk to the underground tunnels and ticket hall below?</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>11. We believe that regeneration must be heritage-led in order to be successful and to minimise the risk posed by unsustainable overdevelopment. Although not nationally listed, the Wards Corner building at 227 High Road (1909) is unique to Haringey and is an interesting example of an early 20th C steel framed building with large internal spaces and huge plate glass windows - it belongs to the same era of technological innovation as buildings such as Selfridges on Oxford Street (also 1909) and deserves to be conserved. The Ward's Stores building is held up as an example of one of the very best and most interesting on the whole historic High Road corridor, and a prime candidate for future restoration. It is an interesting contrast to the 1908 Windsor Parade which has just been so expensively restored. It seems remarkable that the developer does not realise this, or does not choose to, but this is a betrayal of our local heritage.</p> <p>12. As noted elsewhere, the 'lost' balustrade is stored inside</p>	<p>This is a building control issue</p> <p>Conservation and heritage is addressed in the report para. 6.65-6.79</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>the building. The alterations to the windows are minor and do not affect their quality. The clock is apparently in storage somewhere and though I have yet to determine exactly where, enquiries are being made. I totally disagree that the building is in a 'poor state of repair'. I think we would all agree that it wears is hundred years very well indeed as recent internal and external photographs show. Detail on interior pillars, skylights and ceiling plaster work is all intact. The developer's view that its contribution to the Area is 'only neutral' is an absolute nonsense, and it is not for the developer, with a serious conflict of interest, to make such a determination in the first place. The measure of a building's worth is what the local community attaches to it, and the evidence is that Wards Corner has a very strong pull on local affection and cultural memory.</p> <p>13. I also think the developer's assessment of 1a-1b West Green Road is to seriously underestimate this building, which should also be retained. It is also early 20th C and of high quality, part of Tottenham's Edwardian shopping heritage. They are ideal for restoration. Likewise the homes on Suffield Road - this is good quality family housing with private gardens for children to play in and providing green space in this built up area. I think the developer's historical description of the site contains factual inaccuracies which further undermines my confidence in their overall submission.</p> <p><i>Costs</i></p> <p>14. I have looked at the developer's estimates of the costs associated with retaining existing buildings and even a layman can see that these costs are not realistic. I do not intend to go through them line by line but to say that the market value of 227 High Road is £350,000 is nonsense - such a building would command a seven figure price tag. £350k is the price of a three bedroom terrace in N15. Likewise the cost of refurbishing</p>	<p>See answer 11</p> <p>See answer 11</p> <p>The demonstration of viability of retention is considered robust.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>it as £717,000 is a gross overestimate. I believe the building could be brought back into general use for a tenth of that cost. The developer's costs need to be submitted to an independent, impartial review and scrutiny, otherwise we are not serving the best interests of the community, we are simply accepting things on the nod and serving the interests of the developer. Overall I think the developer's cost and value analysis of 227 High Road situation is particularly flawed. The fact is that this building has a cultural, social and heritage value that is far more durable than the buildings that are proposed in its place.</p> <p><i>Local context</i></p> <p>15. On a general note, other large new blocks of flats currently appearing in the High Road seem vast and cumbersome in their context. It does not appear as if the will of developers to maximise profit in our area is being successfully controlled and we risk a permanent transformation of the historic High Road corridor into a canyon of high rises shoe-horned into small spaces and towering over their surviving neighbours. The agenda of development in the High Road is being set by developers and therefore it's no surprise that all the new buildings are gigantic and out of character.</p> <p>16. There is a massive block of flats going up opposite the Swan PH and the other major block on Tottenham Green East. If this development at Seven Sisters is approved we will move a further significant step away from the historic, quality neighbourhood that we know and towards something resembling Euston Road, Elephant and Castle, central Slough or Basildon. As of today's date, over 250 people had signed our online petition in favour of restoring Wards Stores (http://www.gopetition.co.uk/online/14551.html) and there are an equivalent number of signatures on paper in my possession.</p>	<p>See answer 1</p> <p>See answer 1</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>17. I do not think that the Council when it prepared the development brief for Wards Corner envisaged something being proposed on this gargantuan scale. Tottenham will not be improved by continued unsustainable overdevelopment. I strongly believe that this application, which is after all only the developer's opening gambit, should be rejected, and the developer asked to use some imagination and compromise with community interests to achieve a more acceptable and sustainable solution.</p> <p><i>Further to their original objection received 18 March 2008, the Tottenham Civic Society has made a further objection:</i></p> <p>18. The flat roofline is unattractive and incongruous with other buildings in the area; indeed the north-eastern tower block has the air of an municipal incinerator about it. The mass of the building is totally out of keeping with its surroundings; at seven storeys it is more than double the height of existing streetscape; It will cast an extremely large and unwelcome shadow on this part of the High Road, making it cold and sunless.</p> <p>19. The proposals cannot be said to enhance the Conservation Area. It is noted that CA consent for demolition has been granted, but this does not alter the fact that the Conservation Area WILL be damaged by any objective definition. Indeed, it throws the whole existence of the CA at this point of the road into doubt.</p> <p>20. The over-use of glass is out of keeping with the more traditional brick and other material in the conservation area; the areas of brick façade appear artificial and contrived in design. The corner area which aims to evoke the original corner is unfortunately a very insipid, watered-down and characterless attempt.</p>	<p>The scheme is considered consistent with the brief</p> <p>See answer 1</p> <p>See answer 11</p> <p>See answer 1</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>21. There will be extremely serious noise pollution considerations for new intended residents, 24 hours a day. We have concerns about the placing of the pedestrian entrance to the flats so close to the entrance of the Tube station. This appears to compromise privacy of the proposed residents.</p> <p>22. Appeal Court Ruling. We are very concerned that to renew the planning permission for the Grainger development without undertaking the required equality assessment would therefore be directly contrary to the Court ruling and to the requirements of the Equality Act.</p> <p>23. The application does not comply with the DRLP. Specifically, it would not comply with the Mayor's Objective 3 for (I quote) "neighbourhoods to which Londoners feel attached, which provide all of its residents, workers, visitors and students -- whatever their origin, background, age or status -- with opportunities to realise and express their potential and a high quality environment for individuals to enjoy, live together and thrive", nor his Objective 4 for "making the most of London's built heritage". The Grainger redevelopment application also appears to fail to comply with the DRLP's Town Centre Policy 2.15 for sustainable neighbourhoods, nor does it comply with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.8.</p>	<p>Noise is addressed in the report. Street access will lead to a private podium entrance</p> <p>An independent Equality Impact Assessment has been commissioned</p> <p>The GLA are satisfied that the scheme is consistent with emerging London Plan Policy</p>
7	Tottenham CAAC Contact: Matthew Bradby	<p>1. There is no substantial community benefit that would result from the total or substantial demolition of these buildings so as to allow demolition as an exceptional case:-</p> <p>2. The proposed development is not in keeping with the Development Brief for the Wards Corner site nor in keeping with the policies for creating a New Town Centre; The proposal will not create a high quality gateway; It is not an attractive design and does not provide a high quality, imaginative development looked for under PPG</p>	<p>Conservation and heritage addressed in report para 6.65-6.79</p> <p>Design is addressed in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>15 and will not enhance the Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area; It does not create a sense of place, being bland and lacking individual character; Its height, bulk and mass are too great for the area and will overpower other buildings and will destroy the character of the Conservation Area. The Tottenham CAAC object to the application for consent for demolition in a Conservation Area for all the reasons given above.</p> <p><i>Further comments following second consultation</i></p> <p>3. CAAC are aware that Conservation Area consent has been granted but position remains the same. Most appropriate development would be to restore existing buildings</p>	Noted
8	Federation of Small Businesses Chairman Steve Warwick	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not comply with GLA stage 1 report and London Plan policies 2. No social housing 3. Developer may not be able to fund the development but may just sell the site 4. Lengthy lead in time for development 5. Heritage buildings are capable of re-use 6. No apparent s106 7. New builds will destroy, not regenerate 8. Community will be lost 	<p>GLA are satisfied that the scheme is consistent with London Plan policy.</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that affordable housing is not viable</p> <p>Not a planning matter but the development agreement in place requires Grainger to development the site to completion in a timely manner and restricts their ability assign or dispose of their rights or obligations under the DA without consent from the Council</p> <p>Development delayed due to Judicial Review. If permission granted development can proceed</p> <p>Conservation and heritage addressed in report</p> <p>There is an extensive s106 agreement proposed</p> <p>Scheme will bring quality modern development to area</p> <p>Community of retailers will be supported. Market will be provided</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p><i>Further consultation response received following second consultation</i></p> <p>9. Destruction of market, shops and surrounding businesses</p> <p>10. Loss through eviction of tenants from the site</p> <p>11. Members are concerned they could be priced out of area or forced into bankruptcy</p> <p>12. Apparent lack of engagement with local small businesses</p>	<p>temporary location and encouraged to occupy new market</p> <p>Market will be relocated temporarily and re-provided in new development. Shops will be compensated and new scheme will encourage independent retail</p> <p>The s106 will ensure appropriate compensation is given to those affected</p> <p>The scheme will include small retail units for small businesses</p> <p>Local stakeholders have been involved since inception of development brief. Council and Grainger have engaged with business on site</p>
9	Haringey Federation of Residents Associations	<p>1. Not in keeping with planning brief</p> <p>2. Not a landmark gateway development</p> <p>3. Bland building design</p> <p>4. Too tall, it's overdevelopment and not in keeping with Conservation Area</p> <p>5. No affordable housing</p> <p>6. It will be private gated development</p> <p>7. The heritage value of the site will be lost</p> <p>8. Health, education and infrastructure inadequate to support development</p>	<p>The scheme is consistent with the planning brief</p> <p>Design addressed in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p> <p>See answer 2</p> <p>See answer 2</p> <p>It has been demonstrated that affordable housing is not viable</p> <p>The scheme will include improvements to public</p> <p>Conservation and heritage addressed in the report</p> <p>Local infrastructure and services considered adequate. Education and contribution will be made.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>9. No community facilities or local amenities, no new open space</p> <p>10. Will displace local business in favour of chain stores</p> <p>11. Fails to demonstrate environmental sustainability</p> <p>12. Lack of involvement and engagement of local community</p> <p><i>Further consultation response received following second consultation. New points raised below:</i></p> <p>13. In statements and discussions during the Examination in Public on the Draft Replacement London Plan (DRLP) Chapter 2's policies for 'London's Places' it was clear that borough LDF content and decision making should take account of the social and race equality impacts of proposed developments. For the Ward's Corner site, the judge's decision of 22 June 2010 on the Judicial Review for the proposed development was quite clear and we do not consider that anything has changed since then.</p> <p>14. The current market at the site, the businesses of its operators and the availability of its goods for the communities must be preserved in its entirety in accordance with chapter 7 of the DRLP. The local businesses are an essential part of the neighbourhood and the Council has no valid reason for destroying them by allowing the proposed development.</p> <p>15. The Localism Bill emphasises the right of communities to decide what development they want in their neighbourhood and Haringey Council should respect the wishes of residents and businesses in the area. There should be widespread consultation with the local</p>	<p>New public square provided and community market re-provided</p> <p>High street multiples will be complemented by independent retail and market</p> <p>Energy and sustainability addressed in the report</p> <p>Regeneration of Wards Corner has been subject to consultation since inception. The Grainger scheme is product of this process</p> <p>An independent equalities impact assessment has been undertaken</p> <p>The market will be temporarily located and re-provided. The variety of retail units, including the market, and particular dedicated units on West Green Road will promote independent retailers. A Letting Strategy will support this</p> <p>Regeneration of Wards Corner has been subject to consultation since inception. The Grainger scheme is product of this process</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>communities on the development of Wards Corner.</p> <p>16. The current proposal would not be context sensitive and would fail to meet the policies in chapter 7 of the DRLP. It would deprive the residents in the area of goods, services and work opportunities in a way that is contrary to the Government's and the Mayor's policies for sustainable neighbourhoods and multicultural integration.</p> <p>17. Should Haringey Council be mindful to support the Grainger proposal, we would seek that the Mayor directs planning refusal.</p>	<p>GLA are satisfied that the scheme is consistent with London Plan Policy</p> <p>Noted.</p>
10	London Forum	<p>The London Forum is a charity established 22 years to support community groups in the capital.</p> <p>1. In statements and discussions during the Examination in Public on the Draft Replacement London Plan (DRLP) Chapter 2's policies for 'London's Places' it was clear that borough LDF content and decision making should take account of the social and race equality impacts of proposed developments. For the Ward's Corner site, the judge's decision of 22 June 2010 on the Judicial Review for the proposed development was quite clear and London Forum does not consider that anything has changed since then.</p> <p>2. The current market at the site, the businesses of its operators and the availability of its goods for the communities must be preserved in its entirety in accordance with chapter 7 of the DRLP. The local businesses are an essential part of the neighbourhood and the Council has no valid reason for destroying them by allowing the proposed development.</p> <p>3. The Localism Bill emphasises the right of communities to decide what development they want in their</p>	<p>An independent equalities impact assessment has been undertaken</p> <p>The market will be temporarily located and re-provided. The variety of retail units, including the market, and particular dedicated units on West Green Road will promote independent retailers. A Letting Strategy will support this</p> <p>Regeneration of Wards Corner has been subject to consultation since inception. The Grainger scheme is product of this process</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>neighbourhood and Haringey Council should respect the wishes of residents and businesses in the area. There should be widespread consultation with the local communities on the development of Wards Corner.</p> <p>4. The current proposal would not be context sensitive and would fail to meet the policies in chapter 7 of the DRLP. It would deprive the residents in the area of goods, services and work opportunities in a way that is contrary to the Government's and the Mayor's policies for sustainable neighbourhoods and multicultural integration.</p> <p>5. Should Haringey Council be mindful to support the Grainger proposal, London Forum would seek that the Mayor directs planning refusal.</p>	<p>GLA are satisfied that the scheme is consistent with London Plan Policy</p> <p>Noted.</p>
11	North London Business	1. Support the creation of a landmark gateway development and additional housing growth	Noted.
12	Bridge NDC	1. The proposed development will bring significant benefits to the locality which would include a positive effect upon the vitality and viability of the Severs Seven Sisters Centre. The provision of new housing, improvements in public transport and the public realm reduction in crime and the perception of crime, and improved employment opportunities and skills training	Noted.
13	English Heritage Contact: Richard Parish	1. Following the introduction of PPS5, and rejection by the Court of Appeal, the development proposals have been resubmitted with additional information. The scheme of redevelopment remains largely as submitted in March 2008. The proposal includes the demolition of the unlisted former Ward's Corner department store, Nos. 255-259 High Road, and the locally listed 1a-1b West Green Road, all of which are identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such there is a strong presumption in favour of their retention. English Heritage	Conservation and Heritage addressed in the report para. 6.65-6.79

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>does not consider the criteria for their demolition, as set out in PPS5, to have been met. Additionally, we believe that the proposed new development, by virtue of its design, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Recommendation English Heritage's view remains that as set out in our letter 10 January 2010. We would urge the council seek a more sensitive scheme which retains those buildings identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area and which seeks to enhance the character and distinctiveness of the conservation area in accordance with government and local guidance.</p>	
14	Environment Agency Contact: Kai Mitchell	1. We have no objection to the proposed development providing conditions requiring a site contamination risk assessment and foul and surface water disposal management are applied to any permission granted.	Noted
15	Metropolitan Police Contact: Eric Childs	1. With reference to the proposed development at Wards Corner, High Road and West Green Road N15. The Crime Prevention Department has no objection to the scheme and looks forward to the regeneration of this key gateway into Haringey. We have already been consulted on the scheme by the architect with a view to achieving full Secured by Design certification.	Noted
16	GLA Contact: Emma Williamson	GLA comments are summarised in appendix 8.	The GLA are supportive of the scheme.
17	Transport for London. Contact: Anthony Bickmore	1. Our infrastructure teams have reviewed their suggestions and in concept find them acceptable; the subsequent detailed operational interface will be agreed as the project moves forward.	Noted.
18	LBH Transportation	Albeit some transport infrastructure improvement and travel	Noted. These conditions will be applied.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>Team Contact: Maurice Richards</p>	<p>plan measures geared towards minimising car-dependency are critical to this development proposal, it is deemed that these can be achieved through a S.106/S.278 agreement with the applicant to make some contributions towards walking/cycling/public transport enhancement and implement agreed travel plan measures. Consequently, the highway and transportation authority would not object to this application, subject to the conditions that the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provides 235 (two hundred and thirty-five) bicycle racks, which shall be enclosed within a secure shelter. <p>Reason: To improve the conditions for cyclists at this location.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. submits two satisfactory Travel Plans for the residential and commercial/retail parts of the development to the transportation planning section for approval. <p>Reason: To minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. submits the details of the hours and frequencies of delivery to this site by the lorries servicing the retail units. <p>Reason: To ensure that the delivery activities associated with this development will not cause unacceptable level of obstruction to the movement of vehicles on the surrounding roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. enters into a S.106 agreement that: "Except for the twelve (12) houses fronting onto Suffield Road, the residential units are defined as 'car free' and therefore no residents therein 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. 	

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Reason: To encourage the use of sustainable travel modes at this location.</p> <p>5. submits the details of the routing of the associated construction traffic and methods of delivery of goods to the retail/commercial aspect of the development, to the Council and TfL prior to construction, for approval.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise the disruption to the movements of vehicles and pedestrians along the adjoining roads and footways.</p> <p>Informatives</p> <p>1. "Except for the twelve (12) houses fronting onto Suffield Road, the residential units are defined as 'car free' and therefore no residents therein 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.</p> <p>2. 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.</p>	
19	LBH Building Control	1. Access for Fire brigade satisfactory. Means of escape considered under formal BC application.	Noted.
20	CABE Contact: Menaka Sehai	<p>In their letter of 22 May 2008, CABE stated that they were generally supportive of the principle of mixed use development and associated public realm enhancement work.</p> <p>Satisfied with many of the basic propositions underpinning this</p>	Noted.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>design.</p> <p>The Wards Corner site is one part of a wider regeneration area as identified by Haringey Borough Council and it is considered to have the potential to kick start a regenerative process for the wider neighbourhood. Whilst there are a few concerns regarding some aspects of massing and the delivery and maintenance of the public realm enhancement work, we are confident that the design team will be able to address these issues satisfactorily.</p> <p>Recommendation: Subject to good quality detailing and materials, we think that this scheme could potentially achieve the main aim to change perception, and ultimately transform the area. Overall, we think that the design has the markings of a good scheme and we support this planning application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Design is addressed in the report para. 6.80-6.112</p> <p>Noted. Materials will be subject to a condition 4.</p>

APPENDIX 2 PLANNING POLICIES

Minister's Statement: Planning for Growth

NATIONAL POLICY

PPS 1	Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
PPS 3	Housing (2010)
PPS 4	Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009)
PPS 5	Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)
PPS 6	Planning for Town Centres (2005)
PPS 10	Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005)
PPS 12	Local Spatial Planning (2008)
PPG 13	Transport (2011)
PPG17	Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation, July 2002
PPS 22	Renewable Energy (2004)
PPS 23	Planning and Pollution Control (2004)
PPG 24	Planning and Noise (1994)

REGIONAL PLANNING POLICY

The Sustainable Communities Plan (February 2003)

Established growth areas including the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Corridor, which includes the Tottenham Hale Area.

The Mayor's London Plan Consolidated with alterations since 2004 dated February 2008

Policy 2A.1	Sustainability Criteria
Policy 2A.7	Areas for Regeneration
Policy 2A.8	Town centres
Policy 2A.9	The Suburbs: Supporting Sustainable Communities
Policy 3A.1	Increasing London Supply of housing
Policy 3A.2	Borough Housing Targets
Policy 3A.3	Maximising the Potential of Sites
Policy 3A.5	Housing Choice
Policy 3A.7	Large Residential Developments
Policy 3A.8	Definition of Affordable Housing
Policy 3A.9	Affordable Housing Targets
Policy 3A.10	Negotiating Affordable Housing in Individual Private Residential and Mixed Use Scheme
Policy 3A.17	Addressing the needs of London's diverse population
Policy 3A.18	Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure and community facilities
Policy 3A.24	Education facilities
Policy 3A.28	Social and Economic Impact Assessment
Policy 3B.3	Mixed Use Development
Policy 3B 1	Developing London's Economy
Policy 3B 11	Improving Employment Opportunities
Policy 3B.11	Improving Employment Opportunities for Londoners

Policy 3C.1 Integrating Transport and Development
 Policy 3C.3 Sustainable Transport for London
 Policy 3C.21 Improving Conditions for Walking
 Policy 3C.22 Improving Conditions for Cycling
 Policy 3C.23 Parking Strategy
 Policy 3C.24 Parking in Town Centres
 Policy 3D.1 Supporting town centres
 Policy 3D.2 Town centre development
 Policy 3D.3 Maintaining and improving retail facilities
 Policy 4A.1 Tackling Climate Change
 Policy 4A.2 Mitigating Climate Change
 Policy 4A.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
 Policy 4A.4 Energy assessment
 Policy 4A5 Provision of heating and cooling networks
 Policy 4A6 Decentralised Energy: heating, Cooling and Power
 Policy 4A.7 Renewable energy
 Policy 4A.9 Adaptation to Climate change
 Policy 4A.10 Overheating
 Policy 4A.18 Water and sewerage infrastructure
 Policy 4A.19 Improving Air Quality
 Policy 4A.20 Reducing noise and enhancing Sounds cape
 Policy 4A .21 Waste Strategic Policy and Targets
 Policy 4A.33 Bringing contaminated land into beneficial use
 Policy 4B.1 Design Principles for a Compact City
 Policy 4B.3 Enhancing the quality of the public realm
 Policy 4B.5 Creating an inclusive environment
 Policy 4B.6 Safety, Security and Fire Prevention and Protection
 Policy 4B.8 Respect local context and communities
 Policy 4B.9 Tall Buildings – Locations
 Policy 4B.10 Large – Scale Buildings – Design and Impact
 Policy 4B.11 London’s Built Heritage
 Policy 4B.15 Archaeology
 Policy 5A.1 Sub-Regional Frameworks
 Policy 5B.1 The Strategic priorities for North London
 Policy 5B.2 Opportunity Areas in North London
 Policy 6A.4 Priorities in Planning Obligations
 Policy 6A.5 Planning Obligations

Draft Replacement London Plan, 2010

Adoption is due late 2011

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
 Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
 Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
 Policy 3.6 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
 Policy 3.7 Large residential developments
 Policy 3.8 Housing choice
 Policy 3.10 Mixed and balanced communities
 Policy 3.12 Affordable housing targets

- Policy 3.13 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
- Policy 3.14 Affordability housing thresholds
- Policy 4.7 Retail and town centre development
- Policy 4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector
- Policy 4.9 Small Shops
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
- Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- Policy 6.1 Integrating transport & development
- Policy 6.3 Assessing transport capacity
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.2 Creating an inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3 Secured by design
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
- Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Note: An amendment is proposed to Annex 1, Table A1.1 of the replacement plan so that the 'Tottenham Corridor to Stoke Newington' is now included as part of the Lower Lea Valley Opportunity and Intensification Area. If this amendment is accepted, the requirements of Policy 2.13 of the Draft Replacement London Plan become applicable to the application site. Policy 2.13 of the replacement plan encourages development proposals to optimize residential and non-residential densities, provide necessary social and other infrastructure to sustain growth, and where appropriate, contain a mix of uses, and in general support the wider regeneration of surrounding areas.

Interim London Housing Design Guide, August 2010

The Mayor's Other Strategies

- The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy: Cleaning London's Air (2002)
- The Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy: Connecting with London's Nature (2002)
- The Mayor's Culture Strategy: Realising the potential of a world class city (2004)
- The Mayor's London Economic Development Strategy Success through diversity (2001)
- The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy (2004)
- The Mayor's Energy Strategy (Feb 2004)
- The Mayor's Transport Strategy (2004)
- The Mayor's Municipal Waste management Strategy (2003)
- The Mayor's Energy Strategy (2004)
- The Mayor's Planning for Equality and Diversity in Meeting the spatial needs of London's diverse communities SPG
- The Mayor's Draft Industrial Capacity SPG (2003)
- The Mayor's Land for Transport Functions SPG (March 2007)
- The Mayor's Sustainable Design & Construction SPG (2006)
- The Mayor's Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG (March 2008)
- The Mayor's Housing SPG (November 2005)

The Mayor's Industrial Capacity SPG
The Mayor's Accessible London: Achieving an inclusive environment SPG
The Mayor's Wheelchair Accessible Housing Best Practice Guide (BPG)
The Mayor and London Councils' Best Practice Guide on The Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction

North London Sub - Regional Development Framework (SRDF)(May 2006)

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Haringey Sustainable Community Strategy 2007-2016

Adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006

Policy G1	Environment
Policy G2	Development and Urban Design
Policy G3	Housing Supply
Policy G4	Employment
Policy G5	Town Centre Hierarchy
Policy G12	Priority Area
Policy AC3	Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor
Policy AC4	The Bridge – New Deal for Communities
Policy UD2	Sustainable Design and Construction
Policy UD3	General Principles
Policy UD4	Quality Design
Policy UD7	Waste Storage
Policy UD8	Planning Obligations
Policy UD9	Locations for Tall Buildings
Policy ENV3	Water Conservation
Policy ENV6	Noise Pollution
Policy ENV7	Air, Water and Light Pollution
Policy ENV9	Mitigating Climate Change: Energy Efficiency
Policy ENV10	Mitigating Climate Change: Renewable Energy
Policy ENV11	Contaminated Land
Policy ENV13	Sustainable Waste Management
Policy HSG1	New Housing Developments
Policy HSG3	Protection of Existing Housing
Policy HSG4	Affordable Housing
Policy HSG9	Density Standards
Policy HSG10	Dwelling Mix
Policy TCR1	Development in Town and Local Shopping Centres
Policy TCR3	Protection of Shops in Town Centres
Policy TCR4	Protection of local shops
Policy TCR5	A3 Restaurants and cafes
Policy M2	Public Transport Network
Policy M3	New Development Location and Accessibility
Policy M4	Pedestrian and Cyclists
Policy M5	Protection, Improvement and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes
Policy M9	Car free developments

Policy M10 Parking for Development
Policy CW1 New Community/Health Facilities
Policy CSV8 Archaeology

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a Design Guidance and Design Statements
SPG2 Conservation and Archaeology
SPG4 Access for All – Mobility Standards
SPG5 Safety by Design
SPG6 C Restaurant, hot premises-use A3 etc
SPG7a Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement
SPG7b Travel Plan
SPG7c Transport Assessment
SPG8a Waste and Recycling (adopted 2006)
SPG8b Materials
SPG8d Biodiversity Landscaping, Trees
SPG8c Environmental Performance
SPG8e Light Pollution
SPG8f Land Contamination
SPG8i Air Quality
SPG9 Sustainability Statement Guidance
SPG10a The Negotiation, Management and Monitoring of Planning Obligations
(Adopted 2006)
SPG10c Educational needs generated by new housing
SPG10d Planning Obligations and open space
SPG10e Improvements to public transport infrastructure and services
SPG11b Buildings suitable for community use
SPG11c Town Centre and Retail Thresholds
Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2008
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (Draft)

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy (Draft)

SP1 Managing Growth
SP2 Housing
SP4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey
SP5 Waste and Recycling
SP7 Transport
SP8 Employment
SP9 Improving skills and training to support access to jobs and community cohesion
and inclusion
SP10 Town Centres
SP11 Design
SP12 Conservation
SP16 Community Infrastructure

Development Management Development Plan Document (Draft)

DMP1	New Housing Developments
DMP2	Protecting and enhancing existing housing
DMP7	Homes of Different Sizes
DMP9	New Development Location and Accessibility
DMP10	Sustainable Transport
DMP11	Car-Free Residential Developments
DMP12	Parking for Development
DMP13	Vehicle and Pedestrian Movement
DPM13	Sustainable Design and Construction
DMP15	Environmental Protection
DMP16	Development Within and Outside of Town and Local Shopping Centres
DMP19	Employment Land & Premises
DMP20	General Principles
DMP21	Quality Design
DMP22	Waste Storage
DMP23	Commercial Design: Advertisements, Shopfronts, Signs and Security
DMP25	Haringey's Heritage
DPM32	Pre-school and Educational Needs Generated by New Housing

Other Documents

Planning for Town Centres: Guidance on Design and Implementation Tools
 By Design – Better Places to Live (DTLR, CABE September 2001)
 CABE Design and Access Statements
 Secured by Design
 Towards an Urban Renaissance (Urban Task Force, 1999)
 Sustainable Communities: Homes for All (ODPM, January 2005)
 Housing Corporation Design and Quality Standards April 2007
 Diversity and Equality in Planning: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)
 Planning and Access for disabled people: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)
 Code for Sustainable Homes (December 2006) DCLG
 Demolition Protocol Developed by London Remade

APPENDIX 3
SUMMARY OF EQUALITIES IMPACTS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS BY URS SCOTT WILLSON
AND CONDITIONS/S106 PROVISIONS IN
RESPONSE

Appendix 3 - Summary of Equality Impacts taken from URS Scott Wilson Equalities Impact Assessment June 2011

1. Summary of Housing Impacts for Specific Affected Groups

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Loss of social rented housing, including family-sized houses on site, due to demolition & re-housing.	Afro-Caribbean, African, and households from other ethnic backgrounds living in social rented housing Children in affected households	Re-provision in social housing on same tenure status within borough, with additional compensation in line with Haringey Council policy.	Following granting of planning Permission Site preparation phase	Re-provision of affordable housing on site judged unaffordable by Valuation Office	Assistance for existing residents to be re-housed as per Council Policy in s106
Loss of private rental housing on site; no guarantee of re-provision on site within new private housing.	Afro-Caribbean, African, and households from other ethnic backgrounds living in private rental housing Children in affected households	No agreed mitigation measures. Recommended mitigation of support, particularly to households with specific needs, to identify suitable alternative housing in the locality	Following granting of planning permission Site preparation Phase	Re-provision of affordable housing on site judged unaffordable by Valuation Office – understood to include intermediate housing and below-market rental rates.	Existing residents assisted through s106
Loss of owner occupied housing on site, including family-sized houses; no guarantee of re-provision on site within new private housing.	Afro-Caribbean, African, and households from other ethnic backgrounds living in owner occupied housing Children in affected households	No agreed mitigation measures. Assumed recommended mitigation of negotiated purchase and compensation, as well as support, particularly to households with	Following granting of planning permission Site preparation phase	Re-provision of affordable housing on site judged unaffordable by Valuation Office – understood to include intermediate housing and discounted purchase	Existing residents compensated through s106. Scheme includes family units

		specific needs, to identify suitable alternative housing in the locality			
Indirect: Onsite loss of affordable housing, exacerbating existing barriers to housing	BME households, lone parent Households (details according to Haringey HNS 2007)	New affordable housing provision planned within East Haringey at other site resulting in net increase	Over timeframe of site preparation and construction.	N/A	N/A Significant number of affordable units to be delivered elsewhere in east of the Borough

2. Summary of Business and Employment Impacts for Affected Groups

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Business closure/ non-viability of business following permanent loss of existing low-rent market site	Latin-American/Spanish speaking ownership businesses Afro-ownership business African ownership businesses Other BME-ownership businesses	Reprovision of all stalls within reprovided market within new development at open-market rental in improved venue Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders Identification of suitable alternative venues for Temporary reprovision of market	Following granting of planning permission Site preparation phase	N/A	Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Temporary relocation provided for in s106
Break-up of Latin-American market affecting viability of	Latin- American/Spanish speaking ownership businesses	Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders	Following granting of planning permission	N/A	Reprovision of market with right of return for existing

individual stallholder businesses & overall vibrancy.		Identification of suitable alternative venues for Temporary reprovion of market Intention to identify single site for all Latin American traders together	Site preparation phase		traders secured through s106 Latin American identity promoted in s106 Market Facilitator Package
Loss of employment due to stall business closure / restructure	Latin-American/Spanish speaking employees Afro-Caribbean employees African employees Other BME employees	Indirect benefits of mitigation measures directed at businesses	Following granting of planning permission Site preparation phase	N/A	Reprovion of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Temporary relocation of market provided for through s106 Employment support and business advice to stall traders through s106
Loss of shop / business property on site	Muslim shop owner BME-ownership shops and Businesses (understood to include Asian, African, Afro-Caribbean and Latin-American owned businesses)	Provision of 6 new retail units suitable for local shops Investment in improvements to West Green Road retail environment.	Construction Phase Site preparation phase / construction phase	N/A	Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies
Business closure due to inability to afford new market rate	BME-ownership shops and Businesses (understood	Provision of 6 new retail units suitable for local shops	Construction phase Site preparation	N/A	West Green Road units intended for local independent

rental/leasehold	to include Asian, African, Afro-Caribbean and Latin-American owned businesses)	Investment in improvements to West Green Road retail environment.	phase/construction phase		traders and promoted as such through s106.
Loss of employment following any closure/restructure of affected shops / businesses	Muslim employees of Halal business BME Employees (understood to include Asian, African, Afro- Caribbean and Latin- American people)	Creation of new jobs as a result of new development, including in larger shops, and generated indirectly from investment. Indirect benefits of support to existing businesses (as above) Creation of construction employment	Construction phase Completed development – recruitment by businesses Construction phase	N/A	Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies. Business and employment support to existing businesses in s106

3. Summary of Goods, Services & Facilities Impacts for Affected Groups

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Loss of access to outlets for goods & services specific to religion/belief	Muslim customers of Halal meat selling business	Provision of 6 new units sized for local shops in proposed redevelopment. Alternative suitable premises available in local vicinity Alternative retailers exist in area	Construction phase Site preparation phase	N/A	Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.
Permanent worsening	African / Afro-	Measures to protect	Site preparation	N/A	Provision of

of access to outlets for goods & services specific To race/ethnic/cultural	Caribbean and other BME communities in Seven Sisters area Other BMEownership businesses	right of return of existing stallholders Identification of suitable alternative venues for temporary reprovision of market – possibly within other local existing markets. Variety of alternative suitable retail outlets within wider Seven Sisters / North London	phase		independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies. Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Temporary relocation of market provided for through s106
Permanent worsening of access to outlets for goods & services specific to race/ethnic/cultural groups	Latin-American/Spanishspeaking communities in London	Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders Identification of suitable alternative venues for temporary reprovision of Market Intention to identify single site for all Latin American traders together	Ongoing from planning Permission granted – site preparation - construction phase – completion Following planning permission granted – site preparation	N/A	Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Temporary relocation of market provided for through s106
Temporary worsening of access to outlets for goods & services specific To race/ethnic/cultural identity	Latin-American/Spanishspeaking Ownership businesses	Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders Identification of suitable alternative venues for temporary reprovision of market Intention to identify	Following planning Permission granted – site preparation	N/A	Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Temporary relocation of market provided for through s106

		single site for all Latin American traders together			
Increased demand for play spaces and school provision	Children, including amongst future residents of development	New doorstep play space provision within development to meet needs of resident children. Contribution to educational provision	Construction phase	N/A	Playspace provided in development. Education contribution through s106
Share in benefits of improved public realm and shopping facilities	Disabled people, particularly those with physical or Sensory impairments.	De-cluttered pavements, public realm to latest Access requirements.	Construction phase	N/A	Details of public realm improvement required through a condition

4. Summary of community cohesion impacts for affected groups

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Worsening community cohesion by displacing predominant BME groups amongst existing residents, shop owners, market traders and employees.	Latin-American & Spanish-speaking community Afro-Caribbean African Other BME communities	All measures set out in Tables 2 & 3 above to protect permanent and temporary viability of market and businesses, including those measures specific to Latin-American stallholders. The benefits of such measures on community cohesion would be secondary.	Following planning Permission granted – site preparation continued through to construction and completion	Measures specifically directed at sustaining community cohesion not identified.	S106 securing reprovision and temporary relocation of market and promotion of Latin American identity. Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.
Loss to cultural	Latin-American,	All measures set out in	Following planning	Measures specifically	S106 securing

connections and social interaction amongst specific community with shared racial identity	including Spanish-speaking people	Tables 2 & 3 above to protect permanent and temporary viability of market and businesses, including those measures specific to Latin-American stallholders. The effect of such measures on community cohesion would be indirect.	Permission granted – site preparation, followed through in construction and completion.	directed at sustaining community cohesion not identified.	reprovision and temporary relocation of market and promotion of Latin American identity. Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.
Threat to ethnic diversity of area associated with multi-ethnic mix of existing market	All ethnic groups reflecting make-up of existing market stallholders and clientele.	All measures set out in Tables 2 & 3 above to protect permanent and temporary viability of market and businesses. The effect of such measures on community cohesion would be indirect.	Following planning Permission granted – site preparation, followed through in construction and completion.	Measures specifically directed at sustaining community cohesion not identified.	S106 securing reprovision and temporary relocation of market and promotion of Latin American identity. Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.

5. Summary of crime and safety impacts for affected groups

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Need to ensure redevelopment	BME people, women, young	Active, overlooked frontages in new	Completed development	N/A	Condition requiring details of

contributes to addressing crime levels and fear of crime associated with the site	people (both men and women), children, older people, lesbian, gay & bisexual people, disabled people.	development. New public realm designed with consideration of security.			improvement to public realm Condition requiring compliance with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1, 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and with the aims and objectives of 'Secured By Design' and 'Designing Out Crime'
Risk of increased fear of crime / increased opportunities for crime during demolition & construction phase	BME people, women, young people (both men and women), children, older people, lesbian, gay & bisexual people, disabled people.	Recommended best practice measures to enhance external appearance of site, Including appropriate additional lighting. Recommend consult police on appropriate additional security measures e.g. patrolling by police or private security staff	Demolition & construction phase	N/A	Condition requiring suitable appearance and lighting during demolition.

6. Summary of Consultation Impacts

Nature of Impact	Affected Group	Agreed mitigation measures (if any)	Indicative timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	Reason why mitigation measures not possible	Response to recommendation in planning permission
Effective consultation with affected community, recognising	All equality groups, including BME residents, employees &	Approach to date has included variety of means of consultation.	Following decision on Planning Application – as a matter of	N/A	S106 provision for Community Engagement Strategy

diversity and different interest groups to contribute towards sharing of benefits of regeneration.	business owners, visitors & customers.	Recommend urgent revisit of consultation & Engagement approach to respond to criticisms of not listening, quality of consultation and to address long gap in engagement	urgency		to improve consultation with local community following approval
Diversity monitoring to understand effects on equality protected groups	All	Haringey Council to monitor consultation and record mitigation impacts for groups sharing protected characteristics	Consideration of planning application Ongoing following granting of planning permission	N/A	S106 provision for Community Engagement Strategy to improve consultation with local community following approval

7. Possible Barriers to People Sharing Particular Protected Characteristics

Expected benefit of redevelopment	Affected Group	Barriers to their getting a fair share in benefit of redevelopment	How barrier can be removed or reduced (specific to redevelopment)	Why barrier cannot be removed or reduced	Relevant provision in planning permission
Provision of new housing	BME groups – African, Afro-Caribbean (but also affects low income households from different racial/ethnic backgrounds)	Affordability barriers, related to low income/savings levels	Planned delivery of new affordable housing elsewhere in borough	Valuation Office identifies development as unable to afford inclusion of affordable housing	Assistance for existing council and private residents/owner occupiers provided through s106
Provision of new housing	Single-parent households, disproportionately female-headed	Affordability barriers, related to low income/savings levels Cost/availability of child-	National strategies to tackle child care affordability offer some help e.g. child care element of working tax	Valuation Office identifies development as unable to afford inclusion of affordable housing	Assistance for existing council and private residents/owner occupiers provided through s106

		care, particularly affecting women in low to middle-income employment.	credits. Planned delivery of new affordable housing elsewhere in borough		
Provision of new housing	Children in low income households	Affordability barriers, related to low income/savings levels Cost/availability of child-care, impact on household income, particularly where parents in low- to middle-income employment.	National strategies to tackle child care affordability offer some help e.g. child care element of working tax credits but unlikely to be adequate. Planned delivery of new affordable housing elsewhere in borough	Valuation Office identifies development as unable to afford inclusion of affordable housing	Assistance for existing council and private residents/owner occupiers provided through s106
Public realm and streetscape provision, including decluttering	Older people and some disabled people; women, especially from certain faith groups (e.g. Muslim) or racial groups; children; some young people.	Fear of crime, including hate crime, or antisocial behaviour, may prevent individuals from amongst these groups venturing out or lead them to avoid area, based on past experience/reputation	Planned measures to design out crime likely to be beneficial. Measures to promote new identity for area. Community support officers. Engagement with support groups to identify specific concerns and identify appropriate actions.		Condition requiring details of improvement to public realm Promotion of Latin American identity Condition requiring compliance with BS 8220 (1986) Part 1, 'Security Of Residential Buildings' and with the aims and objectives of 'Secured By Design' and 'Designing Out Crime'
Safety measures to reduce opportunities for crime and make for safer environment	Older people and some disabled people; women, especially from certain faith groups (e.g.	Fear of crime, including hate crime, or antisocial behaviour, may prevent individuals from amongst these groups	Effective communication of new safety measures, effective targeting of communications at key		Community Engagement Strategy in s106

	Muslim) or racial groups; children; some young people.	venturing out or lead them to avoid area, based on past experience/reputation	groups		
Business opportunities, particularly in retail sector	Latin-American, including Spanishspeaking Afro-Caribbean, African and other BME groups	Existing businesses may not have turnover / robust business model to be able to afford open market rental levels or compete with national chains	Targeted business training / advice Measures outlined in table 12 likely to contribute.		Business/employment to existing traders/businesses advice in s106
New employment opportunities	Young people BME people with low skills	Lack of experience/skills Lack of relevant experience/skills	Targeted skills training; apprenticeships; targeted promotion of opportunities		Business/employment to existing traders/businesses advice in s106
Transport infrastructure improvements	All groups	No barriers identified	London-wide measures to enable transport affordability likely to be beneficial		Development and implementation of travel plan in s106

APPENDIX 4
EQUALITIES IMPACT ASSESSMENT BY URS
SCOTT WILSON