

APPENDIX 6
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT FORUM
MINUTES 01 FEB 2011



**PLANNING & REGENERATION
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

MINUTES

Meeting : Development Management Forum - Wards Corner
 Date : 1 February 2011
 Place : **College Of Haringey Enfield & North East London**, Tottenham Centre High Rd London, N15 4RX
 Present : Paul Smith (Chair); David Walters, Andrew Beharrell, Cllr Hare, Cllr Schmitz, Cllr Mallett, Cllr Allison, Cllr Diakides, Cllr Engert, Cllr Watson, Approx 220 people attended (Local Residents, Market Traders and Local Businesses)
 Minutes by : Tay Makoon
 Distribution :

		Action
1.	Paul Smith welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained what the meeting was about, that it was not a decision making meeting. A number of people were setting up professional video equipment to video tape the meeting and for photographs to be taken. Paul Smith asked the people not to film the meeting as no prior arrangements or agreements had been made and it was unfair to applicants and officers to be filmed without prior knowledge and consent. A short break was taken to determine whether or not the meeting should go ahead. David Walters said that he would be happy to carry on with the meeting and that any video recordings and photographs taken should be used in the spirit of the presentation made and that he would be very grateful if a copy of the video/ photographs taken tonight could be sent to him.	
2.		
	<p>Proposal Demolition of existing buildings and erection of mixed use development comprising Class C3 residential and Class</p>	
3.	A1/A2/A3/A4 with access, parking and associated landscaping and public realm improvements.	
	<p>Presentation by David Walters I met most of you about two years ago; hopefully I am older and wiser than I was back then. A lot has happened since then, a number of issues have come up in the way that the application was considered and questioned. We have also got one of the largest recessions in our lifetime.</p>	

Wards Corner as pictured on the screen is what it looks like today and many of you live and work on this site and I have met a number of you before. I want to talk to you about Grainger's commitment to this development as it has been questioned a number of times. We are absolutely committed to this development; we have a slide of the Hornsey Road Bath Scheme in Islington. I have taken some of you round it before, it completed in May 2009, it was a Local Authority joint venture with Islington Council on exactly the same basis as Wards Corner it was 212 Residential Units approximately the same size. It was a Council office building, it is an extremely successful development and the fastest selling building in 2009, voted the best public/private partnership award and most importantly the architect is the same for wards Corner, the man who delivered the project is the same Grainger's project manager. We have learnt things from that scheme, we are improving and we are taking the same qualities of that scheme to Wards Corner and we are very committed to doing it. Grainger's is not a build and run organisation, we are a long term investor and manager of communities and residential dwellings. That means when we build, we will carry on managing it and that means when we have designed it we have considered the management into the design.

A site Plan showing site and surrounding including Spurs. We hope Spurs stays in the location it is and not move to the Olympics Park. At some time you have got to believe somebody, you can look at our track record and of course Spurs doesn't have a track record of building lots and lots of different stadiums. You can look at our track record. Tottenham Hale receiving significant amounts of investment at the moment. We have the building we are in at the moment, a fantastic amenity for Tottenham and one that needs to be helped in everyway it can. 1200 students, 700 staff, Wards Corner is the gateway for this establishment.

When we talk about Wards Corner, there are a number of things we talk about a lot of opportunities and challenges, in 2003 there was an independent health check done on Seven Sisters and another one done in 2008 both came to the same conclusion, so what are the positives, accessibility. Fantastic accessibility notable independent traders and independent shops and what are the negatives poor quality and physical environment, retail competition and night time economy those were the things that were flagged up by the independent report.

Consultation started before 2004 development brief the slide is

showing some of the consultation we did during the period we all remember when 2006/7/8 when the application last considered. The slide shows leaflet, Exhibition, letters, presentations website. The website is changing and there is valuable information on it and I would urge you to have a look at the information submitted before Christmas or just after, which we can talk about in detail. The scheme that is proposed today is the same planning application as it was in 2008 following the October 2008 amendments to that application. Is there an alternative plan, I think it is very important to acknowledge the work that has gone in to bring this scheme together. We have looked at it, we have considered it, when I first met a number of you on 12th December 2007 it wasn't long after that being in River Park House with Cllr Amin and a number of Wards Corner Coalition members and we first discussed this proposal with the Wards Corner Coalition and at that point to pay for an advisor of the Wards Corner Coalition choosing to assess the viability of our own proposals and that for this scheme for refurbishment led scheme. The bottom corner of the slide shows the public subsidy requirement to deliver 50% affordable housing of 25 million pounds and public subsidy requirement of 0% of affordable housing of 18.5million pounds. The Grainger proposal does require public subsidy of 2 million pounds.

The Brief

The brief was provided to us following our selection from the tendering process in 2004. The vision that was given to us - to create a landmark development that acts as a high quality gateway to Seven Sisters providing mix uses with improved facilities and safer underground access. Replacement of the under cover market and though outside the remit of the brief would be welcomed.

Presentation by Andrew Berharell - Director of Pollard, Thomas Edward Architects.

I have been working on the Grainger Wards Corner Proposal since the beginning of 2004. I have met a number of you during that time in various meetings when this application was originally first submitted. I am going to say a little bit about sites and constraints and particular features of the site. The application is very detailed and there is a lot of information within it. The next slide shows a map of various connected conservation areas which make up the Tottenham High Road Conservation Corridor, Wards Corner in yellow. It is an acknowledgement that we understand the sensitivity of this site. We recognise the fact that there are a

number of buildings on the site which are recognised as contributing to the Conservation Area and as you are all aware none are actually listed buildings.

There are a number of technical and legal constraints on the site, I am going to say something about three of those because they have a particularly strong influence on what can be delivered here. 1) The underground tunnels - David said that the location of the site right on top of Victoria Line at Seven Sisters underground is one of its greatest assets, it is fantastically accessible, it is also one of its greatest problems because there are four tunnels underlying the site, three running tunnels and one access tunnel and when you take into account the structural no go zones around those they cover more than half the site and that part of the site, it is impossible to sink foundations in-between the walls as you would normally do and therefore they are very strict and delicate controls on how to build on the site and the heights to which you can build and the loads on which you can put on the tunnels. So the structural possibilities are one of the driving factors in the shape of the development. 2) The site is in different ownerships interests, at the beginning of the involvement with Grainger there were around 50 different interests, fewer today because Grainger has acquired and bought some of the properties. The affect of that it takes a long time to piece together the very complicated site as this one. It is also very very expensive. 3) Rights of light envelope, the effects of which the rights of light enjoyed by properties surrounding this site have on how high you can build on different parts of the site. The Wards Corner island site in its totality is closely overlooked by properties in Suffield Close and on all sides. That again has an influence on where you can build and how high you can build.

We have been working on this since 2004 and I have lost count of the number of different design proposals which we have sequentially put forward for this site. The slides show a small selection of different designs we have come up with over a period of 4 years up to the original planning application stage. The orange models were made out of soap originally, that time we were exploring the possibilities of opening up the centre of the site and bringing movement into the site by having a public open space. I mentioned this because it is one of the things that the Coalition would like to see. We analysed the feedback in detail. We had a number of detailed feedbacks from various agencies, including the Councils planners, GLA, Police and retail experts and they were of the opinion that this kind of approach would not work here and we shouldn't try and hope that people would divert from their normal desire line. There is a lot of movement on the High

Road about 13million movements a year.

Major consultation exercise which took place in summer 2007.
Design evolution - I want to touch briefly on one aspect that is the Wards Corner store itself. I know that a lot of you have affection and you want to know what it is going to be used for and want to see it retained as part of the development. The Councils planning brief did not require that but did leave open that possibility and it spoke in oblique terms about facade retention. We looked at a large number of options for the Wards Corner location and that included the retention of the building, retention of the facade of the building, integration of the building into a new development, ideas about taking the new proportions of the building an aspects of it. New proposal even exactly replicating the facade of the new building. One of the addendum reports which accompany this application lays it out in detail. The conclusion of that very detail study which looked not just at the technical and cost viability of these options although is very important but also at the Urban Design heritage implications. The very strong conclusion endorsed by the GLA and by CABE and by the Councils own planning department was to go for a complete break with the store and make new contemporary modern building in that corner which would reflect the future life of the Wards Corner site and not to try to retain elements or to copy elements of the old building.

The application as it is before the Council at the moment in terms of design is identical to the original application with one important implication which is the Governments Environmental targets and requirements have changed an increased in the intervening period. Therefore the Environmental strategy and energy strategy for the application has been developed further and details are within the application documents. At the time of the original application the scheme was based on achieving Code for Sustainable Homes code level 3 and in the meantime the aspirational vision by the GLA is to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Code Level 4.

There are three main elements of the proposed of the redevelopment of Wards Corner which I have explained is proposed as a comprehensive redevelopment of all of the building on the site. First it is a transformation of the pubic realm, the second element is new shops, and the whole of the ground floor of the proposal with exception to the Suffield Road frontage will be given to new shops and a wide variety of those. Third element is new homes, approximately 200 new homes located above the shops and down to ground level on Suffield Road. I draw your attention to the High Road Strategy, a new public place

which is proposed linking into the existing tube entrances this is the centre piece to the new proposal.

Shopping - The kind of range of retails Grainger is looking to attract into the site and the kind of things we don't want to attract here.

We are looking to provide a wide range of shopping to include shops for small independent retailers particularly shops in West Green Road, Seven Sisters Road but also to include larger shops will also appeal to national providers and will provide a wider range and quality to shopping offer. The third element is the proposal to provide an indoor market and to give that a prominent position actually enjoying an entrance from the redesign and redeveloped corner building itself. The proposed new main entry to the residential apartments which is deliberately placed in a prominent position with the shops giving on to the public square, part of the reason for that is that it will have a 24 hour concierge will add active surveillance security not just for residence but everyone using that space. The other element to note is the idea of building new maisonettes on Suffield Road, which will have front gardens directly onto the street. The final point to make is the covered service yard which gives back to the shops and is expected retailers today requires larger space for servicing and the idea is that vehicles come directly in front Seven Sisters Road and do not need to travel all the way through Suffield Road in and out into the service yard and out again. Finally plans showing access to cafe and bar by diagram on slide. Slides of external treatment. Plans of landscaping. Layout plans for the market.

4. David Walters: West Green Road Improvement Fund. I realised that this has had some controversy recently which surprised us. We have talked in great level of detail in the past about regeneration and what that does and the improvements that it brings and at Planning Committee a member of the public stood up in 2008 and what he said was right -Regeneration and improvements in any area comes from the transport interchange which is why you have to start at Wards Corner and slowly and surely this has an impact across that area. What we are trying to do here is that we have lost a couple of years in terms of making those improvements into this area and this improvement fund what we had intended it to be is fast track the impact of this regeneration proposal by providing those local businesses to improve their shop fronts. This is to allow businesses in West Green Road to apply to the Council to improve their shop fronts and improve the environment on West Green Road to improve their businesses. This was an honest offer to help local businesses and help this development improve that environment. In terms of the development what will they do

to conclude, it is about jobs created afterwards, jobs during construction, there were 20 jobs for local people at the construction of Hornsey Baths and permanently employed as a result to that. This development forms part of a district centre, the proposed retail space we are talking about is 35% of that district centre, and this is not taking out a complete district centre. This is providing an offer within it. Shopping, yes it is providing shopping that is different from today, but it is not eradicating what is there at the moment. Investment - it is significant investment as we see Tottenham Hale receives huge amount of money, hopefully Spurs will come forward and do the same. This college is doing the same a very good job, Bernie Grant centre. There is a lot of investment going on and Wards Corner deserves to get in own and this is how we think we can come in. It is about spending, and making sure that spending is retained within Tottenham and providing a safe community. One of feedback was that a lot of people felt unsafe around Wards Corner at night and this development will prove that security. It is about the economy and safe guarding the future of Tottenham. I am very grateful of you turning up and Grainger is absolutely committed to this and we really do think there is support for these proposals, we are here to talk to you, we have talked to you over the last 2 years and please ask any questions this evening and we will do our best to answer them.

Questions from the Floor:

Q1: Latin American Market Trader: I am not really convinced with the new plans for the market? The market is not just a market, it is a cultural centre, people go there not just to buy, but to socialise. To meet people, practice the language. We have Caribbean people, African, Indian many cultures. You guys are destroying these cultures; you did not mention what is going to happen during the period that you are building. What will happen to the market? You say you have 20 jobs but 20 jobs are pathetic. You are going to leave 500 people unemployed. My question is that are you nuts? Do you know what you are doing?

Ans: David Walters answered - Raoul thank you for your question. Raoul you and I have met on numerous occasions about this market and discussed it in great detail. We have met to talk about and including the new market in the new scheme. What we did was to work together to enable a new market to be incorporated into this new development.

Statement from the floor: You mention 20 jobs; those 20 jobs you talked about were 20 jobs during construction not within the completed scheme.

Ans: David Walters answered - Your question about the market - can it be sustained and are we doing anything to help? Raoul following us achieving planning in 2008, we prepared a very long and very detailed presentation to the London Development Agency on your behalf to lobby for funds to help you from them to assist the market. More public money - you are correct, we also provided a pot of money for the traders to assist with that process, we agreed to some very complex and detailed conditions which we discussed with you within the s106 agreements.

Q2: I do not think we agreed to anything, I did not say you agreed to anything Victoria said David. Victoria said I think it is only fair to say that some of the traders here do not understand very well what is going on so I think I will take 2/3 minutes to explain to them what is happening in the meeting. Victoria explained to the Latin American traders in their mother tongue what is going on.

Ans: Paul Smith answered - It was agreed that the meeting will allow Victoria time to translate as and when needed.

Q3: This is a comment: I came across these plans first in the summer of 2003 because I attended the NDC employment theme group. I remember what was said at the time was that what type of shops were going to be in this development and we talked about Starbucks, Woolworths, and all the big players and even at that time I thought it was the wrong approach from Haringey and at that time Grainger's were not mentioned it was the people that did the survey and research. We were also told about these grand plans redeveloping Seven Sisters Station and told everybody that who went to Seven Sisters Station that was being mugged, which was totally untrue and this was taken by one particular officer was giving out and it was that persons word. All the hype about Tottenham being unsafe is not true as I have lived in Tottenham over 20 years and found this is not the case. Yes I have lived round here for 21 years and you have to stop saying things like that as it is not true and you Mr Smith who has been in the planning department in Haringey for a very long time. I never understood back in early 2003 or early part of 2004 why there is this kind of denial about the type of place Tottenham is. It is a diverse community and that diverse community is not going to go away. People have lived here for many many years and their families have settled here and they will live here long into the future. What disturbs me is that we are being presented with is always this white middle class approach.

Q4: Statement: Market - it needs to be made very clear that the plans to include the market did not come from Grainger but from the Mayor of London who put pressure on Grainger to make it a

requirement. So there was no intention to provide a market. The way in which the market could possibly be provided as described involves so many strings that it was impossible to re - provide a market that had any of the characteristics of the existing market it requires 60% of the existing traders to return, markets are not like that once you disrupt them it is unlikely that 60% will return. The money that was talked about of being available is only £96,000 and it is a very small amount of money to reproduce a market. I think the whole point about what this scheme is going to do for this area, is that there has been no recognition about what it going to be lost. That is a lot of jobs, community activities; social and economic activities and losing heritage of buildings that people do feel affection for and can see a different future for. I think it is important to know what is behind what is being put forward here. It is not all of Grainger's idea, a lot of it has been imposed on Grainger and the strings underpinning it would make it impossible to for fill.

Q5: I am a trader from 1 West Green Road; West Green Road has a better trade than surrounding market. Every time you talk about the market and you are not saying anything about the business we are doing in West Green Road. Why are you dividing the market and Businesses in West Green Road? and why not submit them together?

Ans: David Walters answered: I think Mr Patel the question from you is why we have included accommodation for the market and why we have not included accommodation for all the shops in West Green Road/Seven Sisters Road?

What we have done is provide accommodation for the market because we think the market can come back into this location and there has been a will to do that. There is also will for many other retailers to come back into this development and we have had expressions of interest from those people. What it is not possible to do is to replace every single one of those retailers in that location. This development will take two years to complete, it is a very upsetting period for any business to move once and for any business to move twice, and within that period be in temporary accommodation. We have considered that and on balance we have discussed this with you, we found it very difficult to come to agreeable terms.

What the brief asked us to do Mr Patel is to make a stepped change to create a landmark development that delivers variety retailers within Seven Sisters. What we can't do is replace every single retail unit and I acknowledge that and the difficulty that creates. But that doesn't mean we are not committed to the retailers that are there and that doesn't mean that you are any less important than the market traders.

Q6: Ladies and Gentleman I don't know where to start. What this is about is vision. It's one vision that versus another one which is to restore the area. This is a vision that a lot of us would like to put into affect (The Coalition's vision). That is the vision that will keep local businesses, stop the area from being devastated; it is actually going to ensure that we actually get regeneration. Today I heard that if Spurs doesn't get the Stratford Stadium, they will move anyway. These guys have devastated the top of the High Road, they made glossy promises but the big money is behind them and that big money is dictating that Tottenham is not the place to be.

So consequently they are going to move, they do not care about Tottenham. The only people we can trust in Tottenham are the people of Tottenham. We have a vision and we would like to put it into affect unfortunately we have a Council that never allowed us to put this vision into affect or even to discuss it with them. The Council has come up with a preferred developer and they have given this developer two million pounds of NDC Bridge money, this developer has assets according to its website today of 2.3 billion pounds and it has been given 2million pounds of local residents money from the NDC because they say this site is unviable. They stand to make a huge amount of money and they are coming up with this nonsense about unviable. These people are going to come here and get their planning permission and I bet you once they have their permission they are going to sit on the site and they will allow the blight to continue until every last business is out of the area. Then they will sell and move on, just like Spurs will abandon us. They will abandon us because they don't have the finance to do it. These are the guys up and till a 2 weeks ago said on their website that they had planning permission for Wards Corner. In despite of a Court Appeal Judgement they haven't been reported yet to the London Stock Exchange, but we will.

Ans: David Waters answered: I am very pleased that those questions are being asked of us because I can answer them every single one of them. I lived and breathed this for years. I do hope you can hear me out, it is an important issue and Roy is absolutely right to ask those questions. Grainger abandoning the site - The nature of the agreement between Haringey and Grainger doesn't allow us to do that, secondly, I think we have demonstrated that we do deliver, just down the road Hornsey Road Baths. You talked about viability, I talked earlier about how we met on 12th December 2007 and I did two things at this meeting, the first thing I did was to offer you to use our professional team to do a viability study of the scheme that you have just shown us or the scheme known to us as the Coalition Scheme for Wards Corner. The second thing I offered to you was a surveyor of your choice to come and analyse the financial numbers and the viability of not

only your scheme but ours too. That commitment was made but not taken up at that point. In terms of the website, I am responsible for updating the planning bit of the website and I am very sorry but just didn't notice it. Is it fair to say as soon as you pointed out, I updated it? and the reply from the audience was yes. If the London Stock Exchange really changed its view about Grainger based upon its website and not about the endless documents that gets submitted to it every year, then we have diligent vectors looking at Grainger. I cannot emphasise enough how committed we are to this, we cannot emphasise enough that we have looked at the options; we looked at the options you presented. I am completely willing to put on record to allow you to appoint a surveyor the last person you appointed that never turned up to our offices after me arranging two meetings with him was a chap called Mark Bloomen. If you want to arrange a meeting then I am more than happy to meet with Mr Bloomen.

Q7: Ben Voherty: If anyone wants to vote no to demolition, please show your hand and let's see how many people we have. Have you ever lost a child or a wife, mum or anyone in the family? How did you feel? Well that is how I feel, upset, for you to come and hold this meeting for telling us that Wards Corner people that we are not to survive, that is what the market is for us, survival. You can't help my mother. You have not brought change. You have brought things that will define you. Please clarify who are you trying to help, one family or all the families., the market, Latin American people, African people who?

Ans: David Waters answered: Yes, I lost my grandfather recently and my cousin in a cycling accident recently. I was very upset.

The reason why I and Grainger spent so much time looking at this development in a way we have, is that everybody recognise that change is required, even at the first meeting with the Coalition we all agreed that change is required, it is a different kind of change.

Any regeneration scheme is contentious, not one single regeneration scheme in the land is not contentious. It is contagious because it is regeneration. After the last few years we have demonstrated our commitment to helping those on the site, to improve the area, providing a solution to what has become a 30 years problem.

Q8: Expressing my point of view: Living here for over 20 years I have seen buildings going up one after another go down with retail on the bottom and residential above. At least the flats are a mixture of rental and social and private housing. Wards Corner, Grainger says that they want this to be a town centre where people can be proud of; I don't think local people can feel proud if it is based on deliberate neglect followed by total demolition of

everything that is there. We can feel proud of something enthusiastic that is there, cherished of what is there, which developed what is there, which nurtures it. We can feel proud of something that is the same as everywhere else, there are already too many places like that, we are not asking for another one. We are asking for something that we feel at home with, somewhere where we talk to our traders and we do somewhere where it has a soul, warm and vibrant. Somewhere where people are not just relying in their landlords. Somewhere where we can have a proper life. We are not begging for a landlord to come along and manage us, or threatened by demolition. We all want it to be better but we just don't want you to do it, because you are basically doing it all for money. If it wasn't for the money you will not be doing it.

Q9: I want to ask the Council a question. You Grainger were given a brief and here is your proposal. I think the problem stems from the Councils approach to the site, you could have engaged the community before 2004 when this plan was submitted to them and then there was this outcry. There was this cloud of demolition hanging over this site since the 70's. Where is your commitment to the local people?

I would like to follow on with that comment - we have lived here for a very long time and when we saw the consultation about the development brief and the consultation was badly done. They did apologise for some hitches with the way they got the leaflet out and we were shocked at the poor quality of consultation. We wanted to do a deputation to the Council and we organised a deputation of residents and the manager of Seven Sisters Market and a few residents were there and we raised our concerns and we asked for the consultation to be done again. We highlighted the qualities of some of the buildings. The manager of the market had managed to borrow enough money to purchase and restore the buildings and she had arranged a meeting with the conservation officer then the Council cancelled the meeting. This was in 2002, if that meeting had gone ahead then the building would not had been left to dereliction for all these years and could have built on the vibrant market which was already developing and was improving the area enormously. The crime has been reduced to the very nice people doing a lot of active things in the corner of the market.

Ans: Paul Smith answered: I cannot answer on behalf of the Council as I am chairing the meeting, however this meeting is for you to ask questions of the applicant and gain information and raise your concerns. It is not possible for me to answer questions this evening- Paul Smith

Ans: David Walters answered: There is a lot of talk about why there isn't an alternative scheme that is being developed or submitted for planning. There are two planning applications submitted, one which is a refurbishment of the existing market and one which was our application. There are other images that you have shown fairly as an alternative view but that are not a planning application.

Q10: Cllr Schmidt - Although I am a Councillor and I sit on Planning Committee, I wish to make it clear that I will not be sitting on the Planning Committee dealing with this application. Grainger will not and won't be seen to get a fair hearing from me in this particular matter because I have publicly made up my mind to side with those who would preserve Wards Corner. I would also ask for similar restraint is asked of two other Councillors who sit on the Planning Committee. Cllr Stanton and Cllr Peacock have publicly made known their belief that Wards Corner Stores is not worth preserving. Cllr Peacock said that people coming to Tottenham wanted to see something new rather than the old started up and Cllr Stanton has posted on flicker - just to point out that not every local resident agrees with the Wards Corner Campaign as well as being a Tottenham Councillor I have also been a resident over 26 years, we live 2 minutes from Bruce Grove part of the Council, cares very much about Tottenham future and about the attractive and often beautiful buildings along the High Road, Wards Corner is simply not one of them. As he has made up his mind he should not be sitting on the Committee, he is also very connected to someone who use to work for the NDC. I am simply talking about the situation being bias.

I recall from a similar presentation that is architecturally for not preserving the wards Corner Stores. One could not build to the height desired by this development without putting a pier to the site of the store. Why not build lower so that a pier is not required? Your planning permission was thrown out by the court of appeal because of the lack of an equality assessment. Cluttons who have provided the equality assessment concludes that the proposed development not unlawfully discriminate against any identified equality group, but they have misconstrued the law, what is required is that the impact on the various groups be examined not that they be prejudiced by the decision they have made, whether that is done or not is a matter for the Court not a matter for an expert. (This is for the Officers). I also noticed that in this rather long report no attempt has been made to assess the impact on the Liberian and Latin American communities that actually use the market. The provision which you are proposing to make for small local traders and to restore the market. Can you please give me a

little bit more detail to as to the sort of commitment that you would make that would be sufficiently definitely be part of an enforceable part of a s106 agreements that would ensure that small local traders actually get the shop and as far as the market goes, what commitment are you prepared to make to keep the head lease rent down to a level that people who wants a stall in the market have an affordable price.

Ans: David Walters answered: Not Preserving Wards Corner, there is a report within our planning application, not sure if you have had time to read that, that talks in great detail about the constraints around saving the building as Andrew mentioned we looked at the facade and retaining the building, integrating the building into the development, you talked about the Court of Appeal ruling and they that had been addressed by our application , you will no doubt know that the Court of Appeal ruling required Haringey Council to undertake an Equality Impact Assessment. Do you agree? Yes was replied. Grainger's Equality Impact Assessment is not the final as pointed out Haringey will have to do their own. In terms of the s106 agreements, I talked a lot about this with a lot of people and what our commitments are. Our commitments are that we will not include betting shops, fast food outlets; it is not in our best interest to do that. We talked about unit design for independent traders on Seven Sisters Road and talked about the retail mix of those retailers. In terms of what goes into the s106, we have talked in great detail about what that does. What we have done is provide a conditions list to allow the market traders to come back in. If you look at it from our point of view what we don't want is a development that sits empty because we are waiting for the market traders to decide whether to come back into the scheme. So we included a clause that highlighted the timing about those traders coming back in. Somebody mentioned the 60% earlier on. When we first thought through this I never thought that it was bad for you, I thought it was good for you. The reason behind that is that you don't want to just a Latin American market, or a fish market or something else. The clause was to ensure that it didn't become something else. If you wish us to remove that, then just tell us about it. We really saw that as a benefit for you and not us. In terms of rent, if you rent a property of poor quality or something middle of the range, you then move to something a bit bigger, or better quality, then the rent changes.

That is the way things happen. What we are proposing is to bring that Wards Corner facade into life through the Seven Sisters market, making the Seven Sisters corner the entrance to the market which we are really excited about and yes the rent will be a Little more. We want a viable successful market and it has to be an open market rent. We cannot guarantee you the same rent you pay now within a market that is tucked behind a facade in

some respects and doesn't have the same amenities the new one has and is managed by a national market operator who will potentially be able to advertise and market this market much wider than it is at the moment.

Q11: I have a barber shop inside the market; I am only 20 years old and have been in London for 8 years. I would like you to stop talking about the pretty market of yours because the money that was offered to us a long time ago was £93,000 to come back, if you divide that £93,000 into 63 units, it would be 1,500 per trader.

Do you really think you are supporting our community? Do you really think £1,500 for two years - that is just your way of kicking us out? Stop telling everyone that you are talking about us.

Ans: David Walters answered: Compensation payment mentioned in the s106 agreements, the intention for that was to hopefully work together with that pot of money and to ensure the market is brought forward. Those of you operating in the market operate under a licence, that licence gives you significant flexibility to walk away within seven days it does not entitle you in statute to any compensation. You do not have a lease you have a licence. If you read the latest document the amount has gone up to £104,000.

Q12: When you say very generous, we look at it from your point of view. You think that my hard work all my life, I have raised my children in the market. I brought my daughter when she was 5 years old, she is now 17 years old and nothing has happened to her. We did have a discussion about how much money we are entitled to as you say we only have a licence. What that means is we do not count. That is very unfair. I have knocked on so many doors in the Council to ask what will happen to our future, and was told don't worry you can relocate somewhere else, like we do not exist, and we are only third world people so we don't count. That is the way you are treating us. Tell me the number of jobs that is going to be lost in the market.

Q11: I query the idea of regeneration strategy that is heavily being based on the provision of retail space for national retailers; this to me seems to ignore 3 factors. One is the existing retail space at Tottenham Hale and Bruce Grove, secondly the retail space at Tottenham Hale is much larger than would be provided at the Wards Corner site, thirdly, it completely ignores the shopping corridor at Wood Green High Road which is much larger and has a much larger retail outlet and does a much larger volume of trade.

It is hugely unlikely that any national retailer would wish to take up space at the new Wards Corner site. It needs to be recognised that Tottenham is no longer a preferred destination for shoppers

out of the area.

Ans: David Walters answered: we have a tube station on the Victoria Line which is 12 minutes from Kings Cross, it has about 13million passengers going through it every year, we have had discussions with some retailers and it answers the questions, they are very interesting as a location, the difficulty they have had is being able to find accommodation in Seven Sisters for them to take up. They would like to be in a new/improved environment.

Q13: A resident

I have heard about the volume of traffic passing through the corridor, 3 million people, how wonderfully they have done in Hornsey, Knightsbridge. There is a flaw in your premise that all areas are the same but they are not the same. We live in Seven Sisters and according to EU statistics; Wards Corner is the most culturally diverse per square mile in Europe. What have you done in your planning of this development to take into account the culture diversity in this area? It is not the amount of traffic coming in/out in this area. I live in Suffield Road and we have people living there for three generations. I have lived there for two generations and you have not taken into account the people who live here. You need to do a proper study. This idea is not going to work. You can have rent for some crappy apartments and it will be £3 in Tottenham and £75 in Hampstead. The areas are not the same and you cannot use Hornsey, Knightsbridge as an example and think we have the same aspirations as you. What are you doing to address the cultural diversity of this community?

Ans: David Walters answered: It is not the same. What we have done is included a ground floor that has accommodation for 8 national retailers that also have accommodation for a market which includes 50 businesses. We also have 9 nine units design for independent retailers. If you look at it in business scale that is circa, 59 independent businesses and 8 national retailers before you get on the statistics that this site is a mere 5% of the district centre. – It is not a town centre and you are absolutely right. It is 5% of the district centre in terms of floor space. In terms of getting national retailers here we all know that we can find those 59 businesses, locally and culturally diverse, you are all here.

Q14: I want to give an advice to Grainger – You are loosing a lot of money in many years of discussion. Every four years they there could be a new Mayor of London and every four years the Mayor can make a vito. Two years ago during the elections for Mayor of London, the candidates came to the Seven Sisters market to say they will be against the demolition of Wards Corner. In one and half years time there will be another election and again the candidates will say they will be against demolition, why because

Tottenham has a lot of votes and there are 250,000 Latin American and foreign speakers on the electoral roll, they cannot win the elections if they say they are going to demolish Wards Corner. You need to talk to the Wards Corner people and us to keep the building that is the only solution.

Q14: Mr Thompson – One of the added advantages of having been a Mayor is that I learnt how to be fair and I haven't seen anything so totally disgustingly unfair as the people of Tottenham have been treated in the Wards Corner. What you are doing to the people of Tottenham is adding salt to injury because not only have you been told by the High Court that you are out of order, you still trying to dress up and bring this back and it still isn't going to work. The people of Tottenham deserve better, never mind what Tottenham Hotspurs are doing or whatever Grainger is doing. You need to understand this, you don't live here we do and we decide what we want.

Q15: Why do you want to go ahead with this development when everybody is against it? If it's not just about money, then why go ahead. You are going against our wishes.

Ans: David Walters answered: Does anyone support this development? No one responded from the audience. There were two people in support of this development they stood up at planning committee. People do not come out in support but only when they object. Yes, we do want to do this development, we are committed to it, we have worked long and hard to bring this forward and it will have a positive impact on Tottenham it is essential to safeguard wards Corner.

Q16: Do you not learn from history? Are you not afraid of another riot?

Q17: I find it incredible to believe you call this meeting a Development Management Forum and yet you do not have a senior officer to be able to answer our questions this evening. As someone said our beef is not with Grainger, they were given a brief and they delivered it. We need answers from the Council and there isn't anybody here to answer our questions?

Ans: Paul Smith answered: There are Council Representatives, the Assistant Director, Planning & Regeneration, Myself Paul Smith. However, we are not here to answer questions, as the meeting is for you to ask your questions of the applicants. The constitution of this meeting is an exchange of information where the applicants explain their scheme to the residents and for residents to respond. There are other avenues for you to pursue to get answers to your questions.

Marc Dorfman said: I have been for the last month has been phoning and emailing the wards Corner Coalition to ask them if they would like to come and meet me talk to me about what their concerns and issues are and to date I am still waiting for that meeting to be set up. I would still like to have that meeting and secondly, it is very important that we go through the usual process of dealing with major applications. With Wards Corner there has been a lot of concerns about the process of the application how that has been handled and managed, not at least there has been a judicial review. So we want to go through carefully that process in the normal and usual way. If you want to make representations to me or your local ward councillors and additional public meetings, please do that and I will be happy to respond positively.

Q18: We are told the same application has been re-submitted, you and your architect talked about new papers and information on your website. There is nothing on Haringey's website so the papers haven't been published. I fail to see how this can be a new valid application. Lots of things have changed since they submitted their information. Are you not going to do a new financial statement?

Ans: David Walters answered: Paul rightly said it is the same application we have re-submitted some documentation which I understand is on the Councils website, certainly on our website. Wards Corner regeneration.co.uk, you can go and pick it from there. We talked about a new planning statement, new conservation area statement, equality impact assessment there is an energy statement as the code level is now 4 instead of 3. There is a new document which is a new toolkit under GLA guidance which is a financial assessment of the scheme. What happens with this document is that an independent advisor of the GLA and Haringey and that independent advisor then briefs the GLA and Haringey whether it is correct and whether the scheme can affordable housing and other s106 benefits. The toolkit as in every regeneration scheme is used in schemes like this is a confidential document which is why an independent assessment is carried out. The GLA uses this day and day out.

Q19: In my book regeneration is about people as well as well as place, I think the requirements by the Lord Justices for extra information from you on indeed the equality and diversity impact and implication of your proposal goes to the heart of the last hours of this discussion. Listening to you I cannot imagine what possible statement you put in to support that you have met those requirements, you have no affordable housing. I think you are offering the traders a sum of £1.500 for two years and you did not

answer how you would ensure 50 or so culturally diverse traders in the market which was insisted upon by Sir Simon Milton would be able to return. Does your website contain your response to the High Courts requirements, if so can you elaborate on that please.

Ans: David Walters answered: I think this goes back to the Equality Impact assessment which you rightly say is a requirement by the Court of Appeal to be undertaken. The requirement by the Court is not on Grainger but on Haringey in assessing this application. Grainger has done its own Equality Impact Assessment which is publicly available and mentioned today.

Q20: I question whether you understand the social importance of this site. You mention the London Plan, which you say London wide criteria. I question whether you understand the London wide importance of this site. It is the only focal point for the Latin American social and trading point for the Greater London community. What the architects and developers are doing to maintain this very rich social and ethnic asset to London but not in terms of plots and zoning because plots and zoning merits cannot be quantified within those ways.

Ans: David Walters answered: Part of that answer is in relation to our discussion with other organisations and helping local businesses manage themselves through this process and we did engage through the NDC and they were part of this process. We did engage the North London Business, NDC. We did workshops with KIS (Keep it Simple Training) and we have included the market. I think we have demonstrated how Wards Corner is important. We have made an offer for all local businesses to have an independent property advisor, those in West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road. Only one took it up. We have given great considerable concessions to people who live and work on the site. I think to date there are people still living in Suffield Road without paying rent and we have made other offers on those lines and people have accepted.

Ans: Andrew Beharell: This scheme is a long evolution years and more has been design with great precision and care for its particular setting and I accept that many people here don't like it. A lot of time has gone into designing this scheme in its context.

Q21: Mital Patel statement: How do you get cultural bits into the scheme, you actually invite people into the design process.

Q22: The toolkit, are we suppose to accept the Councils word that we cannot have social housing on this site. They got it wrong the first time and we took them to Court and we proved that did it wrong and hence the assessment. Will that toolkit be made

available to us or do we have to rely on the Council that we cannot have social housing on the site. What are you doing about the welfare of the businesses around the market, they might not be accommodated but what are you doing now?

Last year you evicted one of your tenants? Why?

Ans: David Walters answered: He was evicted because he wasn't paying his licence fee; he was blocking the road and causing a nuisance.

Q23: I was told at the consultation meeting that this would be M & S and that would be Boots. This was not what we were consulted about. Will we ever have an accurate consultancy with the Council? And will Grainger agree to that.

Ans: David Walters answered: The conclusion slide is wrong: You are creating 20 jobs, The Cushman report says you are creating 80, and so that is job losses. It is already a district centre. This is becoming the Latin American Quarter in North London and you will lose that as Elephant and Castle is going to take all the money away. This is an opportunity, nowhere else offer you such choice. Provide investment in Tottenham, well we would have that instantly if you just walked away. Gated community? You are inviting trouble. You said you wanted a shot, have you heard of a parting shot, just go.

Q24: John Oakes: Hornsey Baths was mentioned as being very successful as a Grainger project. I pass that very regularly as I do Wards Corner and one of the most successful elements is the retention of all of the original building, including the neon diving lady, then he went on to say we have learnt from Hornsey Baths and put the same quality of that scheme into the Wards Corner scheme. What qualities is he going to take into the Wards Corner Scheme and why I haven't heard any good reason why the old building needs to be demolished?

Ans: David Waters answered: Hornsey Baths is listed and had to be retained. The chimneys are not listed and have no requirements to retain that chimney but Grainger has decided to keep the chimneys as this was appropriate for this site. We all want to improve Wards Corner and we have to find a solution to make it work. We do not take the decision to demolish heritage buildings lightly that is why we analyse the coalition scheme that retains the market, and the front building and I have presented all the information this evening. This scheme requires 25million of public money subsidy. My commitment and offer still stands for you to come and inspect those numbers. We are really trying to find a way to make this development brief come to fruition. It has been one of the most difficult problems any developer can face, multiple ownership, building over 4 underground tunnels.

End of Meeting

Paul Smith reminded everyone to submit their comments to the Planning Service if not already done so and further representations can be made at Planning Committee. He thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the meeting.

APPENDIX 7
SUMMARY OF GLA REPORTS

Summary of GLA comments

An updated Stage 1 report was issued 21 June 2011 following the re-determination of the scheme. Stage I and Stage II reports were previously issued during the initial consideration of the scheme. Appropriate sections of these reports are also summarised.

Stage 1 Report (updated) 21 June 2011

The proposal has not substantially changed since the previous Stage I and Stage II reports. As such this report only deals with new information and areas where the London Plan or Government Policy has changed. The comments on design, child play space, community facilities and transport set out in previous reports still stand.

Equalities

The methodology of the Council's Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) is considered acceptable. The EqIA concludes that the development is unlikely to result in major negative equality impacts provided that all measures set out in the section 106 agreement are implemented in a timely manner.

The market, local retails and principle of land use

The proposed offer is a combination of multiples, local retail and the Latin American market. The proposals deliver a range of retailing options for all types of businesses. Within this offer six units are specifically allocated for local retailing. As such, the proposal would have a positive impact on the centre.

A social and economic impact assessment as set out in London Plan policy 3A.25 has been produced together with a retail impact assessment and a market assessment. The developer has replaced the market in the development and provided units specifically designed for local retail and the Council is satisfied that their plans will be a positive benefit to the area and the local community. The proposed scheme therefore complies with London Plan policy 3D.3, 3A.25 and 3B.1 (The Mayor will seek a range of workspaces of different types, sizes and costs to meet the needs of the different sectors of the economy and firms of different types and sizes). These policies are carried forward into the draft replacement London Plan in policy 4.8 and a new policy 4.9 has been introduced which specifically relates to the provision of units suitable for local retails. The proposal also complies with the draft replacement London Plan in this regard.

The retention of the Latin American Market also complies with London Plan policy 4B.8: Respecting local context and communities given that the market is replaced within the development as well as draft replacement London Plan policy 3.17 protection and enhancement of social infrastructure.

It is also considered 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.

Affordable Housing

The loss of 10 affordable housing units on site is not in accordance with London Plan policy but is considered acceptable in this instance given the wider regenerative benefits of the scheme.

London Plan Policy 3A.10 requires borough councils to seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mix-use schemes. Policy 3A.10 is supported by paragraph 3.52, which urges borough councils to take account of economic viability when estimating the appropriate amount of affordable provision. The 'Three Dragons' development control toolkit is recommended for this purpose. The results of a toolkit appraisal might need to be independently verified

Haringey's UDP contains a policy regarding affordable housing which states that housing developments capable of providing 10 or more units will be required to include a proportion of affordable housing to meet an overall borough target of 50%. The proportion negotiated will depend on the location, scheme details or site characteristics.

A toolkit has been submitted with this application which shows that it is not viable to provide any affordable housing as part of the development. The toolkit has been independently verified by the Valuation Office Agency and it has been confirmed that the development cannot support affordable housing on viability grounds.

The applicant has robustly demonstrated that it is not viable to provide any affordable housing in this development and whilst this is regrettable the position is accepted.

Heritage

The scheme involves the demolition of all buildings on site. Part of the site lies within a conservation area. Three of the existing buildings are locally listed. The applicant has looked at the retention of this building in the scheme but has concluded that this would not be viable. This approach has been agreed with Haringey Council officers. Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of all buildings on the site was granted in November 2008 and this permission still stands. As such the principle of demolition has been accepted

English Heritage has set out that whilst it accepts that it would not be viable for the current scheme to reuse the existing buildings that public benefit could also be delivered through a conservation based scheme. The applicant has considered the viability of variations of the scheme which retain one or more of the existing locally listed buildings and Haringey Council has confirmed that none of these options are financially viable or deliverable.

Given the relatively low significance of the assets, their current condition, the public benefits of the regeneration and replacement market provided by the scheme, the non-viability of the variants of the scheme and the extant conservation area consent it is considered that the loss of the assets is justifiable.

Overall, the proposed scheme makes a positive contribution to the conservation area and the wider townscape and is acceptable.

Climate Change Mitigation

The applicant is proposing the application of energy efficiency, CHP and renewable energy. As a result, the development will emit 165 tonnes per annum in regulated carbon dioxide emissions. This represents a saving of 100 tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum (38%) compared to a 2010 Building Regulations compliant development. The energy strategy is supported and is in line with London Plan policy.

Transport

No new transport information has been submitted. The transport elements of the scheme were considered to be, on balance acceptable, previously.

Conclusion

The regeneration of this site with a mixed use development is welcomed. The replacement of the market and the provision of local retail space is welcomed and addresses the concerns raised regarding previous iterations of the scheme and is, on balance, acceptable in strategic planning terms. The significant improvements to the public realm and the improved quality of retail provision is also welcomed. The applicant has robustly demonstrated that no affordable housing can be provided on viability grounds. The energy strategy is in line with London Plan policy.

Given the measures proposed in the section 106 agreement relating to the provision of a market facilitator and the right to return for market traders the proposal is unlikely to give rise to major negative equality impacts, provided that provision of a temporary market is made before the existing market closes. The negative impact of the non-provision of affordable housing is justified by the fact that it would not be viable to provide affordable housing and the planned provision for such elsewhere in the local area. The Council should ensure that the measures suggested in the equalities impact assessment to assist existing residents with relocation are secured.

Stage II Report – 03 December 2008

Design

The previous stage I report concluded that the “the architectural approach is on the whole welcomed, the particularly the High Road centrepiece, the Suffield Road blocks and the brick treatment, however, the set back upper storeys and the corner treatment appear awkward and should be reconsidered.”

The upper storeys are now glazed and further details submitted of the corner treatment. The issues raised in Stage I have been resolved.

English Heritage support a conservation-led approach to regeneration.

CABE, overall, felt that the scheme had the potential to transform the area and supported the scheme.

The proposed scheme is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area and wider townscape and would be in compliance with the London Plan in design terms.

Transport

In view of the highly accessible nature of the site, it was recommended that the scheme be made car-free. However parking is provided for the town houses on Suffield Road. All other occupiers of the development will be prevented from obtaining a permit by s106 agreement. Travel Plans for the commercial and residential elements of the scheme will be secured by condition and this is welcomed in order to mitigate travel demand.

Construction routing should minimise impact on the TLRN. A construction strategy should be secured by condition to ensure that there will be no impact on the Underground Station or tunnels during excavation and construction.

London Development Agency

The LDA supported the principle of the scheme at Stage I but raised a number of issues relating to the existing market and wider regeneration potential of the scheme. Following discussions with the applicant, the LDA welcomed that the section 106 agreement secures replacement of the market and associated measures to assist the temporary relocation of the market traders. The LDA considers that there are no strategic issues in relation to retail facilities.

The LDA also welcomed a requirement to submit a Training and Local Labour Agreement as well as a requirement to procure goods and services from local businesses and recruit local people.

Stage I Report – 04 July 2008

Housing

Although the proposed dwelling mix deviates from that contained in the Council's Housing SPG (now SPD), it is considered appropriate to the busy town centre location.

Children's Playspace

The development provides approximately 1,538 sqm of amenity space within a central courtyard which includes a dedicated playspace for children under 5. The site is also within 400m of Brunswick Road Open Space. The provision is acceptable in strategic planning policy terms.

Urban Design

The proposed density and site layout are acceptable. The scale of the development is considered acceptable having regard to the scale of Apex house and the Tesco development. Towards the rear the development scales down to relate to the neighbouring residential development. The development will transform the public realm by creating anew public square.

The internal layout of the proposed flats is acceptable.

The architectural approach is on the whole welcomed, the particularly the High Road centrepiece, the Suffield Road blocks and the brick treatment, however, the set back upper storeys and the corner treatment appear awkward and should be reconsidered.

Community Facilities

At the time of the initial Stage I report, the proposal included a youth facility however it was recommended that the space be given over to accommodate the market.

London Development Agency's comments

The LDA support the principle of the development. The variety of retail spaces is welcomed. Every effort must be made to find alternative accommodation for the existing market traders whilst the development is constructed.

The developer should seek to ensure that local residents and businesses benefit from the job opportunities created by this proposal. Initiatives to create training and employment opportunities and to utilise the goods and services of SME's and local businesses should be formalised through a section 106 agreement.