

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

25 June 2012

Reference No: HGY/2012/0915 and HGY/2012/0921	Ward: Tottenham Green
Date received: 05 May 2012	
Address: : Wards Corner Site, High Road N15 Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use development comprising class C3 residential, class A1/A2/A3/A4 uses, with access, parking and associated landscaping and public realm improvements and associated Conservation area consent for demolition (HGY/2012/0921) Existing Use: Retail and Residential Proposed Use: Mixed Use (C3, A1/A2/A3/A4) Applicant/Owner: Grainger (Seven Sisters) Ltd.	

DOCUMENTS
Title
Planning Statement
Heritage Statement
Consultation Statement
Management Strategy Report
Energy Strategy
Daylight and Sunlight Report Jan 2008
Noise and Vibration Exposure Assessment Jan 2008
Structural Engineering Report Jan 2008
Contamination Survey October 2007
Economic Impact Assessment
Archaeological Desk Bound Assessment
Construction Management Report
Transport Assessment
Equality Impact Assessment

Plan Number	Plan Title
10153/F/01-01	Survey Drawings
8444/T/01A-06	
8444/T 02A-06	
8444/T 03A-06	
8444/T 04A-06	
8444/T 05A-06	
8444/T 06A-06	

P(00)21B	Site Plan
P(00)00A	Basement Floor
P(00) 01E	Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 02C	Upper Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 03C	First Floor Plan
P(00) 04C	Second Floor Plan
P(00) 05B	Third Floor Plan
P(00) 06B	Fourth Floor Plan
P(00) 07C	Fifth & Gallery level Floor Plan
P(00) 08C	Sixth Floor Plan
P(00)10B	Roof Plan
P(00)100D	Tottenham. High Road and Seven Sisters Road
P(00)101C	Suffield and West Green Road + Int. Corner
P(00)102D	West Green, Suffield + 7 Seven Sisters Detail Elevations
P(00)110C	Elevational Site Sections AA BB and CC
P(00)111D	Elevational Site Section DD and EE
P(00)112A	Kiosk Plans and Elevations

Case Officer Contact:

Jeffrey Holt

P: 0208 489 5131

E: jeffrey.holt@haringey.gov.uk

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS:

Tube Lines

Conservation Area

Road Network: C Road

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION ref: HGY/2012/0915 subject to conditions and subject to s106 Legal Agreement..... plus Mayoral Direction

GRANT CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT ref: HGY/2012/0921 subject to condition

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The application proposes the demolition of all buildings on the site known as Wards Corner 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.

The application is a revised version of a previous proposal which was refused on grounds that (1) its bulk massing and design would neither preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and (2) that it would constitute "substantial harm" to Heritage Assets with insufficient justification by the applicant that the development will deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

The scheme addresses the first reason by amending certain elements of the design so that building has a more positive relationship with Conservation Area by having a bulk, massing and design commensurate to the character and intensity of activity in this location and sympathetic to the architectural language of the area while retaining the legacy of the Wards Store building through the 'Memory Boxes'.

In respect of the second reason, the significance of the Conservation Area as a single "heritage asset" has been assessed and it is considered that demolition of all buildings on site, while entailing the loss of some buildings of architectural interest, would not result in "substantial harm". This less than substantial harm is considered to be outweighed by the significant physical and economic regeneration benefits of the scheme.

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 have been consented to elsewhere in the east of the borough.

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 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.

In determining this application, officers have had regard to the Council's obligations under the Equality Act 2010.

The detailed assessments outlined in this report demonstrate that on balance there is strong planning policy support for these proposals embodied in the Local Development Plan and backed by Regional and National Planning Guidance. Therefore, subject to appropriate conditions and s106 contributions the application should be approved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
1.0	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
2.0	IMAGES
3.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
4.0	PLANNING HISTORY
5.0	PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION
6.0	RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY
7.0	CONSULTATION
8.0	ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATION
8.1	Application background
8.2	Regeneration Policy Context
8.3	Development Brief
8.4	Regeneration and Economic Benefits
8.5	Retail Uses
8.6	Seven Sisters Market
8.7	Residential
8.8	Density
8.9	Dwelling Mix
8.10	Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access
8.11	Amenity space
8.12	Children's Play space
8.13	Affordable Housing
8.14	Viability
8.15	Conservation
8.16	Design
8.17	Community Safety
8.18	Daylight and Sunlight
8.19	Traffic and Parking
8.20	Sustainability and Energy
8.21	Archaeology
8.22	Contamination
8.23	Air Quality
8.24	Drainage
8.25	Noise and Vibration
8.26	Environmental Impact Assessment
8.27	Equalities Impact Assessment
8.28	Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement
8.29	Greater London Authority (GLA)
9.0	HUMAN RIGHTS
10.0	EQUALITIES
11.0	PREDETERMINATION
12.0	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
13.0	RECOMMENDATIONS
14.0	APPENDICES
	Appendix 1: Consultation Responses
	Appendix 2: Planning Policies

Appendix 3: Development Management Forum Minutes
Appendix 4: Not used
Appendix 5: Planning History
Appendix 6: Summary of EqlA impacts and Proposed Responses
Appendix 7: EqlA prepared by URS Scott Wilson
Appendix 8: Summary of Previous GLA reports
Appendix 9: Court of Appeal Judgement
Appendix 10: Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief

1.0 PROPOSED SITE PLAN



2.0 IMAGES



View from Broad Lane



View north-west from High Road



Illustrative view of public realm



Illustrative view of podium amenity space

3.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The Wards Corner site is a prominent site located on the Western 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, which are all 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.
- 3.2 The site comprises retail and commercial floorspace on the ground and first floors on the High Road footage with retail and commercial on the ground floor and residential above on the other two main frontages. Suffield Road is a one way road and is different in character being a relatively quiet residential street. There are currently 33 residential units falling within the boundary of the site.
- 3.3 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 and is also the subject of the Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief dated January 2004.
- 3.4 The 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 significant number of traders are from Spanish speaking backgrounds. The site has a public transport accessibility level of 6 (where 1 is low and 6 is high).

4.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 HGY/2008/0303 – REFUSED - This application was first submitted in February 2008 and approved in December 2008. In June 2010 the decision was quashed by the Court of Appeal (see Appendix 9). Following the submission of further information from the applicant, the Council re-determined the application with a recommendation for approval but this was overturned by the Planning Sub-committee. A full timeline of events is provided in Appendix 5 Planning History.

- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 HGY/2008/0177 – NOT DETERMINED – 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. The applicant was by the Wards Corner Coalition.
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 HGY/2011/1275 – PENDING - External alterations to front and rear elevation including new shopfronts, angled bay windows and dormers, and reinstatement of rear upper floor windows and formation of new windows.
- 4.6 Prior to the above applications, 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.

5.0 PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION

- 5.1 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 3,693 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 196 new homes, the majority of which are at first floor level and above and situated around a communal amenity space at first floor level. This amenity space is accessed via a main foyer facing onto the High Road. The remaining units are 18 family homes with direct access onto Suffield Road. The proposed development would include improvements to the public realm on the High Road and

other frontages. The proposal includes the provision of 44 basement car parking spaces (including 3 disabled) and 196 cycle spaces.

6.0 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

6.1 The planning application is assessed against relevant National, Regional and Local planning policy, including relevant:

- National Planning Policy Framework
- The London Plan 2011
- Haringey Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2006)
- Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance and Documents
- Draft Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies:

Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies (formerly the Core Strategy) was submitted to the Secretary of State in March 2011 for Examination in Public (EiP). This EiP commenced on 28th June and an additional hearing was held 22 February 2012 to discuss subsequent amendments and the Sustainability Appraisal.

The Council is currently undertaking a 6 week consultation from 27th April to 13th June 2012 on how the recently published NPPF may affect the content of the Plan. As a matter of law and due to the advanced stage of development, some weight should be attached to the Local Plan policies however they cannot in themselves override Haringey's Unitary Development Plan (2006) unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

- Haringey Draft Development Management Policies:
The consultation draft of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) was issued in May 2010 following the responses received. The DM DPD is at an earlier stage than the Core Strategy and therefore can only be accorded limited weight at this point in time.

6.2 A full list of relevant planning policies is in Appendix 2

7.0 CONSULTATION

7.1.1 Statutory Consultees

- GLA
- LB Hackney
- LB Waltham Forest
- London Development Agency
- Transport For London Road Network

- London Underground
- English Heritage - London Region
- English Heritage - GLAAS
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Thames Water Utilities
- British Waterways – London
- Met Police Crime Prevention Officer - Andrew Snape
- London Fire Brigade - Edmonton Fire Station
- Government Office For London
- Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service
- London Waste Ltd
- Network Rail
- The Highway Agency
- North London Chamber Of Commerce

7.1.2 Internal Consultees

- Building Control
- Transportation
- Waste Management/Cleansing
- Food and Hygiene
- Strategic and Community Housing
- Environmental Health – Noise and Pollution
- Policy
- Housing
- Conservation and Design

7.1.3 External Consultees

- Ward Councillors
- Lynne Featherst
- David Lammy MP
- Tottenham Civic Society
- Tottenham CAAC
- Bridge Renewal Trust

7.1.4 External Consultees

- Ward Councillors
- Tottenham Civic Society
- Tottenham CAAC
- Design Panel

7.1.5 Local Residents

- Consultation letters were sent to the residents of 748 properties

- A Development Management Forum was held on 30 May 2012 attended by approximately 230 local people and businesses. However, due to disruption by some attendees, the forum was closed early. The minutes are attached at Appendix 3

7.2 A summary of statutory consultees and residents/stakeholders comments and objections can be found in Appendix 1. Consultation responses raised the following broad issues:

- The building is too large and the design inappropriate to the character of the conservation area
- The demolition of the buildings on site will result in a loss of character and is not justified by the replacement building
- The displacement of existing residents, traders and businesses will cause harm to livelihoods, community cohesion and local character
- The development will not have a positive economic impact
- The retail units and market are not viable
- The market will not survive temporary relocation
- Local residents will not be able to afford to purchase the flats and local business will not be able to afford to rent the commercial units

7.3 Attendees of the Development Management Forum raised the following broad issues that were relevant to the current application:

- The size of the units in the re-provided market
- The basis for demolition of the buildings on site
- The provision of public toilets
- The type of jobs created by the development
- The terms and conditions for market traders to return to new market
- Compensation for business and residents on site

7.4 Officer's views on these comments are as follows:

- The size of each stall is equivalent to the size of the stalls in the existing market however the overall size of the market is slightly smaller due to a more efficient layout
- The demolition of the buildings is considered to be justified by public benefits brought by the scheme (section 8.15)
- Toilets are provided in the replacement market in the same way as they are provided in the existing market. There is an existing public toilet adjacent to the Clock Tower at Apex House
- Employment opportunities will be provided from the development's construction and its occupant businesses. The

applicant's Economic Benefits Report estimates 268 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs created directly by construction and 255 FTE by the occupant businesses, a net increase of 100 jobs (see section 8.4)

- A suite of measures are proposed to ensure existing market traders are given the full opportunity to return to the market (see sections 8.6 and 8.28)
- Residents and business which own their properties will receive compensation through the CPO process and signposted to existing support services of Haringey Council

7.5 Planning Officers have considered all consultation responses and have commented on these both in Appendix 1 and within the relevant sections of the assessment in section 8.0 of this report.

7.6 While the statutory consultation period is 21 days from the receipt of the consultation letter, the planning service has a policy of accepting comments right up until the Planning Sub-Committee meeting and in view of this the number of letters received is likely to rise further after the officer's report is finalised but before the planning application is determined. These additional comments will be reported verbally to the planning sub-committee.

Design Panel

7.7 The scheme was presented to the Haringey Design Panel 31 May 2012. The minutes of which will be reported to the Planning Sub-Committee.

7.8 The panel recognised the overall need for redevelopment, the principle of housing and constraints placed on the site by the Underground Tunnels. The following further points were made:

- Concept of the public square and the design of the podium was supported
- Given the location within a Conservation Area, there is a need for a high quality, landmark building
- A more intricate and detailed approach suggested
- Concern about how the two corner buildings related to the lower building enclosing the square
- The use of glass on for the penthouse floors and their massing was questioned.

7.9 Design is discussed in more detail in Section 8.16 however officers views on these comments are briefly provided below:

- The building is considered to be viable, high quality design which responds to the severe constraints of the site
- The size and massing of the building is commensurate to the size of the junctions and dominance of the High Road in this location
- The simpler approach to detailing is welcomed as it is taken to be a modern interpretation of London street architecture more appropriate to this location
- The use of glass on the upper floors minimises the impression of bulk by appearing lighter in weight and marking a strong delineation with the brick façade below

Applicant's consultation

- 7.10 The applicant has undertaken its own extensive consultation prior to and during the Council's consideration of the first proposal for the Wards Corner site submitted in February 2008.

Prior to 2008 planning application

- Letters to tenants, businesses, stakeholders, Ward Councillors during summer 2007
- Meetings with Tottenham Civic Society, Residents' Associations and NDC
- Exhibition
- Press releases and newsletters

During 2008 planning application

- Leaflets to 10,132 homes, stakeholder and businesses in the Tottenham area
- On-site exhibition
- Permanent exhibition at Marcus Garvey Library from March to November 2008
- Articles in the NDC's "Word" magazine
- Updates on Grainger and NDC websites
- Meetings with GLA and political representatives
- Meeting with market traders representatives
- Presentation to and letters to all market traders
- Independent ICM poll May 2008 of local residents

- 7.11 Changes were made to the scheme following this round of consultation and the scheme was approved by the Council however, in 2010 the permission was ultimately quashed by the Court of

Appeal. The Council then re-determined the application. As no changes were made to the scheme, the applicant did not undertake any consultation beyond that of the Council's own statutory consultation. The application was ultimately refused by the planning sub-committee in 2011.

7.12 The current application seeks to address the committee's reasons for refusal and the applicant considered that additional pre-application consultation was not necessary. However, following submission of the application the applicant promoted the scheme in the following ways:

- 10,000 plus leaflets distributed to households and businesses in the surrounding area
- The project website (now www.sevensistersregeneration.co.uk)
- Adverts in the Haringey Independent and Tottenham Journal in May and June 2012
- Online advertising on the website of the Haringey Independent and Tottenham Journal in May and June 2012
- Letters to all on site residents and businesses
- Letters to all stakeholders

7.13 As part of the current submission, Grainger plc commissioned The Consultation Institute to review the consultation undertaken in 2007/8.

"The Consultation Institute's overall conclusion is that the 2007/8 consultation was structured and delivered in a professional manner. Whilst there are one or two areas where the consultation could have been better, on balance the applicant has demonstrated good practice throughout." (Wards Corner regeneration, Seven Sisters, Review of public consultation in 2007 for GL Hearn by The Consultation Institute, April 2012).

7.14 Full details of the applicant's consultation can be found in their Consultation Statement submitted with the application.

8.0 ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

- 8.1 Application Background
- 8.2 Regeneration Policy Context
- 8.3 Development Brief
- 8.4 Regeneration and Economic Benefits
- 8.5 Retail Uses
- 8.6 Seven Sisters Market

- 8.7 Residential
- 8.8 Density
- 8.9 Dwelling Mix
- 8.10 Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access
- 8.11 Amenity space
- 8.12 Children's Play space
- 8.13 Affordable Housing
- 8.14 Viability
- 8.15 Conservation
- 8.16 Design
- 8.17 Community Safety
- 8.18 Daylight and Sunlight
- 8.19 Traffic and Parking
- 8.20 Inclusive Design
- 8.21 Sustainability and Energy
- 8.22 Archaeology
- 8.23 Contamination
- 8.24 Air Quality
- 8.25 Drainage
- 8.26 Noise and Vibration
- 8.27 Environmental Impact Assessment
- 8.28 Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement
- 8.29 Greater London Authority (GLA)

8.1 Application Background

- 8.1.1 This application is a resubmission of previously refused scheme ref: HGY/2008/0303. The reasons for refusal were:
- The proposed development by virtue of its bulk massing and design neither preserves nor enhances the historic character and appearance of the Tottenham High Road Corridor / Seven Sisters / Page Green Conservation Area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of National Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Creating Sustainable Communities (2005); PPS 5, Policies UD3 'General Principles' & UD4 'Quality Design' and CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Haringey UDP.
 - The proposed development would involve the loss of designated heritage assets as defined in Annex 2 of PPS 5 and would constitute "substantial harm". The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the substantial harm is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.
- 8.1.2 In brief, the current application seeks to address the reasons for refusal in the following ways:

- Reduction in height and bulk
- Simplified corner and elevations
- Revised public realm and greenery
- Inclusion of “memory boxes”
- Re-appraisal of heritage impacts

8.1.3 These issues are discussed in detail in sections 8.15 ‘Conservation’ and 8.16 ‘Design’.

8.2 Regeneration Policy Context

8.2.1 National planning policy is set by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was published 27th March 2012 and replaces all previous Planning Policy Statements and Guidance. Within the framework there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development “which should be seen as a golden thread running through plan-making and decision-making” (NPPF para. 14).

8.2.2 The NPPF places great emphasis on the need for the planning system to support sustainable economic growth. This includes the need to identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. The application site is identified as a site for regeneration in the following policies.

8.2.3 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.

8.2.4 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 Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies.

- 8.2.5 Policy SP1 'Managing Growth' of the Haringey Local Plan aims to manage growth by focusing it 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.
- 8.2.6 A number of changes were agreed at the Local Plan's 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 significant redevelopment in this location.
- 8.2.7 It is considered that there is strong policy support for comprehensive regeneration on this site.

8.3 Development Brief

- 8.3.1 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.
- 8.3.2 The activities of the bridge NDC were led by the Communities Partnership Board. The Board was made up of 23 members, of which 12 were local residents. The Partnership Board was involved in promoting the redevelopment of Wards Corner for five years. The Community Conference day on the 1st February 2003 informed residents of plans for the Wards Corner Project.
- 8.3.3 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.

- 8.3.4 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.
- 8.3.5 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 Borough's Haringey Retail Capacity assessment (Sept 2003) which also identifies Wards Corner as a focus for development to improve the District Centres shopping environment.
- 8.3.6 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".
- 8.3.7 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, make the best use of the opportunities presented by the site and must enhance the Conservation Area. New buildings shall be of distinctive and modern design and 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.
- 8.3.8 The brief has been incorporated into the UDP 2006 and is consistent with the emerging Haringey Local Plan. The development brief remains in force and is a material consideration when determining applications for development at Wards Corner.
- 8.3.9 It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the Development Brief.

8.4 Regeneration and Economic Benefits

- 8.4.1 The proposed scheme will result in the comprehensive redevelopment of the site providing a number of physical and economic regeneration benefits for the area.
- 8.4.2 In terms of physical regeneration, 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 to improve pedestrian flow and the entrance stairs to the underground Station will be retained and reclad and covered by glass canopies. Two new retail kiosks with historic 'Memory Boxes' (see section 8.16 'Design') 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 and sheltered by a line seven trees. There will also be seven clipped hornbeams arranged along the curved frontage of the building. The space will be provided with high quality cycle parking, street lighting, signage, bus stops, benches and other street furniture.
- 8.4.3 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. The development will provide high quality facilities for national multiple retailers and expand the retail offer in the area. The proposed development would result in the provision of 196 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.
- 8.4.4 The applicant's have commissioned a survey by ComRes which in April 2012 interviewed 577 adults in the Seven Sisters Area about their views of Seven Sisters, and how they use local shops and facilities and their views on the proposed development. Briefly, the majority of residents identify investment and change as a key priority with three quarters preferring to see a mix of national and local shops and restaurants as well as flats, new public space and a new market hall.
- 8.4.5 The comprehensive nature of the scheme allows for the delivery of significant physical regeneration that can address a number of varied negative elements in the physical environment and meet the desires and expectations of many local residents.
- 8.4.6 The applicant has submitted an Economic Benefits Analysis report by GL Hearn which estimates the impact of the scheme on the local economy. The development site currently supports an estimated 155 full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs. GL Hearn has estimated the

additional direct, indirect and induced economic impacts which can be expected to result from the development scheme:

- Direct creation of 255 FTE permanent jobs from the delivery of new commercial floorspace, a net increase of 100 FTE jobs on existing levels, as well as an additional 20 indirect and induced FTE jobs in the local area;
- Growth in the resident population of 325 persons which will support indirect and induced permanent employment of around 75 FTE jobs, the majority of which can be expected in the local area;
- 268 temporary construction jobs within the local area over the two year build-out period of the development, as well as an additional 322 indirect and induced jobs through wider supply chains and local spending;
- An uplift in local taxation resulting from the improve quality and quantum of commercial floorspace as well as additional residential units;
- An overall uplift in retail expenditure within the West Green Road/ Seven Sisters District Centre of over £11.3 million per year which will support the vitality and viability of the Centre and long- term sustainable regeneration.

8.4.7 These economic impacts will be of considerable benefit to the area. The GL Hearn report identifies the following regeneration issues within the Tottenham Green Ward, which covers the application site:

- High levels of deprivation;
- High unemployment and worklessness;
- A lack of suitable job opportunities in the local area; and
- An above average crime rate.

8.4.8 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 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.

8.4.9 Within Tottenham Green Ward 9.2% of working-age residents (aged 16-64) in Tottenham Green Ward claiming Job-Seekers Allowance (JSA) in March 2012. Unemployment, using this measure, is more than twice the London average. Long-term unemployment is also

notably above average, with 52% of the 827 JSA Claimants in Tottenham Green Ward in March 2012 having been claiming JSA for over 6 months. Male unemployment is also above average, standing at 11.3% in the ward. JSA Claimants are however only a subset of overall unemployment. Department for Work and Pensions data indicates that there were 2,175 persons of working-age in the ward in August 2011 claiming key out-of-work benefits, representing 24.2% of the working-age population – again above the Borough and London averages.

- 8.4.10 The GL Hearn report states there are likely to be a range of reasons which explain the high levels of unemployment and worklessness in the Borough, including skills and multiple barriers to accessing employment for those who have been out of work for some time. However, the report identifies a lack of local- based job opportunities as one possible factor. National statistics indicate that in 2009 there were just 47 jobs in Haringey per 100 residents of working-age. This compares with 88 jobs per 100 working-age residents across London and 78 nationally.
- 8.4.11 Crime levels in Tottenham Green Ward are above average for Haringey, 18.2 crimes per 1,000 resident population in Tottenham Green Ward compared to an average 10.98 across Haringey according to the Metropolitan Police's crime mapping website (as at March 2012). Haringey has the second highest levels of crime of the Outer London Boroughs.
- 8.4.12 There is therefore a strong need for regeneration in the local area and the proposed scheme will help to deliver its physical and economic regeneration. Although the above analysis was undertaken recently, the positive impacts of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme have been identified before and during the submission of the first scheme on this site. Since then, the need for regeneration is considered to remain the same, if not stronger.
- 8.4.13 The Bridge NDC have previously commissioned reports which assessed the likely impacts the proposal would have on the area.
- 8.4.14 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. 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 district centre.

- 8.4.15 In March 2008 the Bridge NDC commissioned a report by Shared Intelligence 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.
- 8.4.16 Although these reports were commissioned prior to and during the initial consideration of the first application in 2008, it is considered that their conclusions still hold as the factors identified in the reports are still present.
- 8.4.17 In the first GLA Stage 1 report of July 2008, The London Development Agency (LDA) 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.
- 8.4.18 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.
- 8.4.19 The GLA’s Stage 1 report in for the previous scheme issued 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. The GLA’s stage 1 report for the current application will be reported to committee however, the GLA have maintained their support for the scheme historically.
- 8.4.20 Since the first planning application was 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 Seven

Sisters scheme will play a complementary role.

8.5 Retail Uses

- 8.5.1 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. The Seven Sisters Road frontage is designated as secondary.
- 8.5.2 The proposed development will provide 3,693m² of new retail floor space, a net increase of 610m² above the existing provision on the site.
- 8.5.3 The proposed retail element is essentially the same as that proposed under the previous scheme with the size and layout of the shops 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. These smaller units are intended for local independent retailers. Tenancy of these units will be subject to approval by the Council to ensure these units are occupied as intended.
- 8.5.4 There is a small ground floor restaurant of 33m² and a first floor restaurant of 320m².
- 8.5.5 The proposed retail floor space includes an 865 sqm market hall to accommodate the existing Seven Sisters Market. The replacement market is slightly smaller than the existing as it has a more efficient layout however it will be large enough to accommodate the same number of stalls with the same amount of space per unit as the existing market.
- 8.5.6 The ComRes survey identified a strong desire for a greater mix of retail in the area, including national and local shops. The proposed development is well placed to respond to this as well as provide a level of retail commensurate to the site's function as a major transport hub and district centre.

8.6 Seven Sisters Market

- 8.6.1 Policy 4.7 of the London Plan 2011 'Retail and Town Centre Development' 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. A key element of the previous and current schemes is the re-provision of the existing Seven Sisters Indoor Market. This has been identified as shown on drawing no P(00)01 rev

E including an illustrative layout for the market, subject to agreement with the market operator.

8.6.2 The existing 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.

8.6.3 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.

Replacement Market

8.6.4 The re-provision of the indoor market is a key element of the scheme. The market has a gross floor area slightly smaller than the existing market but this is due to a more efficient layout. However, the actual stall units are the same size as those in the existing market.

8.6.5 The market will be re-provided 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.

8.6.6 As under the previous scheme, a package of measures is proposed in the s106 agreement to help ensure the market is re-provided successfully.

8.6.7 The s106 agreement requires the replacement market to 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.

8.6.8 All existing traders will be offered a first right to occupy on an exclusive and non-assignable licence of an equivalent stall in the new market area, on reasonable A1 open market terms. This

obligation 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.

8.6.9 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.

8.6.10 As was proposed under the previous scheme, 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 package is identified in the independent equalities impact assessment as being key to the acceptability of the proposal in equalities terms.

8.6.11 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.

8.6.12 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 the site. 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.

- 8.6.13 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.
- 8.6.14 In sum, the re-provision of the market in addition to the new retail and restaurant units 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.

8.7 Residential

- 8.7.1 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. The NPPF stresses the importance of boosting the supply of housing through the delivery of sustainable development.
- 8.7.2 The site is identified in the UDP in planning policies AC3 ‘Tottenham High Road Corridor’ and AC4 ‘The Bridge NDC’ as a development site for mixed use. The site is also referred to directly under Site Specific Proposal 21 (SSP21) in the UDP as a site for mixed use development. There is therefore no objection in principle to residential use on the site.
- 8.7.3 Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies SP1 and SP2 continue this approach.

8.8 Density

- 8.8.1 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 3.2 proposes a residential density of between 650 and 1,100 hrph for this type of site.

- 8.8.2 The site is 0.717 ha in area (including half the width of the main road frontage) and the existing density of the site is 119 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph). This is far below the target density and represents an under-utilisation of a highly accessible site.
- 8.8.3 The proposed development proposes a total of 564 habitable rooms resulting in a density of 787hrph, which is a small reduction from the previous scheme but still consistent with the requirements of the London Plan and represents more appropriate level of development for this site.
- 8.8.4 The proposed density is also in accordance with Haringey Local Plan Policy SP2 'Housing' as this policy is also based on Table 3.2 of the London Plan.

8.9 Dwelling Mix

- 8.9.1 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 (24.5%)
 - 109 x 2bed (55%)
 - 34 x 3bed (18%)

- 8.9.2 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.
- 8.9.3 The proposed dwelling mix is very similar to that proposed under the previous scheme. In that instance it was considered that due to the district 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.
- 8.9.4 Officers hold the same view for the current scheme.

8.10 Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Access

- 8.10.1 As was the case in the previous scheme, all units provided will be of Lifetime Homes standard with the exception of the 18 duplexes on Suffield Road, 4 units in Block L and 2 duplexes in Block K as these units have first floor living rooms. However, these 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.
- 8.10.2 In accordance with the Housing SPD, 20 flats, 10% of the total, will be fully wheelchair accessible or easily adapted for wheelchair use.

8.11 Amenity space

- 8.11.1 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.
- 8.11.2 The proposal for some 1538m² of amenity space is unchanged from the previous scheme. It is located within a central courtyard at first floor level and 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, timber decking, ramped access to lower gardens and lighting to the main footways. The provision of amenity space exceeds that required by the SPD and is considered acceptable.
- 8.11.3 As under the previous scheme the amenity area incorporates a children's play space (see section 8.12 below).

8.12 Children's Play space

- 8.12.1 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.
- 8.12.2 The Haringey Open Space and Recreation Standards SPD sets out the Council's own play space standards under the current UDP and

the emerging Haringey Local Plan. Using its formula 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.

- 8.12.3 In the same way as the previous scheme, development is designed to comply with the more onerous standards of the London Plan SPG thereby exceeding 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.

8.13 Affordable Housing

- 8.13.1 The NPPF states that where it is identified that affordable housing is needed, planning policies should be set for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. However, such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time (para. 50).
- 8.13.2 Similarly, The London Plan (2011), policy 3.12 states that Boroughs should seek "the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing...when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes", having regard to their affordable housing targets, the need to encourage rather than restrain residential development and the individual circumstances including development viability".
- 8.13.3 The Haringey UDP (2006) sets out the main objectives for the east of the borough including "greater opportunity for large scale redevelopment to address the area's deprivation" and "greater housing choice" (in addition to access to jobs, improved public space, transport and environment). In particular Policy AC3 "Areas of Change – Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor" states that housing must become more mixed and balanced, more sustainable and there must be less (opportunity) for transient homes. Furthermore, it states that new schemes should not exceed 50% affordable elements and where affordable housing is proposed, it should focus on "shared ownership, key worker and sub market

homes". This approach is continued in the Haringey Local Plan.

8.13.4 In the case of the development of this site the applicants have demonstrated 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 8.14 'Viability' below.

8.13.5 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.

8.14 Viability

8.14.1 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 and during its subsequent re-determination in 2011. Both appraisals were submitted 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.

8.14.2 The applicants have submitted an updated appraisal to accompany the current scheme and as before it has been assessed independently by. DVS have reported that the appraisal is reasonably based. Although there was some disagreement between the applicant and DVS regarding finance costs, both parties have come to the same conclusion that the scheme is not viable if it included affordable housing. The introduction of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), has placed a significant financial burden on the scheme and due to the high cost of development on this site and its associated impact on viability, there has been a reduction in some elements of the s106 contributions in financial terms (see section 8.31 'Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement').

8.14.3 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.

8.15 Conservation

- 8.15.1 As with the previous proposal the current 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. Conservation Area Consent (CAC) for this demolition is being sought concurrently to this application.
- 8.15.2 CAC for the demolition of all buildings on site was granted 17 November 2008 in conjunction with the initial planning permission for the previous scheme. Although that permission was ultimately quashed by the Court of Appeal, the CAC remained extant until its expiration 17th November 2011. As such, the principle of demolition has been accepted previously. However, following the re-determination of the previous scheme in 2011, the application was refused by the Planning Sub-Committee for two reasons, one of which is related to conservation and is set out below:
- *The proposed development would involve the loss of designated heritage assets as defined in Annex 2 of PPS 5 and would constitute "substantial harm". The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the substantial harm is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.*
- 8.15.3 Accordingly, the scheme's impact on the designated heritage assets is reconsidered in this section.

Consultation responses

- 8.15.4 Several consultee groups and a significant number of local residents have objected to the demolition of all buildings on the site. Conservation issues raised by a number of key groups are briefly summarised below:

English Heritage (EH)

- English Heritage objected to the previous application and object to the revised scheme.
- Notwithstanding improvements to the scheme and the need for economic regeneration, the loss of a substantial part of the conservation area and its replacement with a substantial mixed-use development will cause substantial harm to the conservation area and as such requires justification under paragraph 133 of the NPPF.
- In this instance it is understood that justification is sought through the economic benefits of the proposed mixed-use development.
- It has not been demonstrated that the wider benefits could not be delivered by a more conservation led scheme which better preserves or enhances the significance of the conservation area
- The character of the conservation area is derived principally from the Victorian and Edwardian development of the area as a local civic, residential and commercial centre.
- Whilst it is acknowledged that lack of investment, and poor quality alteration, has eroded some of the aesthetic quality of this part of the conservation area, the area retains the coherent appearance of its Victorian and Edwardian streetscape and there is little to suggest the condition of the majority of buildings prevents all reasonable uses of the site.
- Whilst it may offer other economic benefits, the scale and form of the new development is not considered to preserve or enhance the defined character of the conservation area. Nor can it be considered to enhance or better reveal its significance.
- If the local authority is minded to grant permission for the proposed development we would request that special attention is given to ensuring that the palette of materials for the new development and public realm contributes positively to the setting of the conservation area

Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) and
Tottenham Civic Society

- The design is bland and characterless and would not preserve or enhance the conservation area. It is not the high quality landmark building required by the development brief

- The loss of heritage buildings, especially the landmark locally listed Wards Corner buildings would destroy the historic character of the area. It will also create big gap in the High Road Historic Corridor and conflicts with the Council's policy for the High Road as a whole
- The proposal is unlikely to create any regeneration of the area and will result in continued blight and vacant shop units like in other areas of Tottenham
- The future of the site lies in refurbishing Wards Corner, which is basically in sound condition, and having an imaginative scheme which can build on the independent businesses there

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

Conservation Policy

8.15.6 The NPPF replaced PPS5 as the national policy document on conservation of the historic environment however the policy approach is broadly similar to that of PPS5.

8.15.7 The application site is partially within the /Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area which encompasses roughly the buildings on both sides of the High Road from Tottenham Town Hall south to railway bridge with a small spur along Broadlane including Page Green Common, Earlsmead Primary and part of Wakefield Road.

8.15.8 Conservation Areas are 'Designated Heritage Assets'. As under PPS 5, Annex 2 of the NPPF defines a 'Designated Heritage Asset' as any World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation. It is therefore important to note that the heritage asset in this instance is the Conservation Area as a whole and not any particular building within it (except those that are statutorily listed). Therefore, the impact of the proposal is not the impact on the demolished buildings themselves, but the impact of that demolition on the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole. As such, the above reason for refusal is inaccurate as it refers to the loss of "designated heritage assets" where in fact no such loss would occur as only one "designated heritage asset" (i.e. the Conservation Area) would be affected and only part of it would be demolished, not its entirety. The conservation impact of the current proposal is therefore assessed in these terms.

- 8.15.9 Paragraph 129, states that Local Planning Authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal.

Character Appraisal

- 8.15.10 In March 2009, the Council adopted a completed character appraisal for the Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor (THRHC) which includes the Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area. The THRHC stretches approximately 3.7km between the southern and northern borough boundaries. As a result it is relatively diverse in character and appearance.
- 8.15.11 Amongst the diversity the unifying element of the THRHC is the High Road itself and adjoining development is a response to its historic function as a major arterial road. Accordingly, most of the High Road is lined with commercial premises and is generally characterised by intensively developed, high-density urban environments. This built up frontage is interrupted by a string of historically significant isolated open spaces at Scotland Green, Tottenham Green and Pages Green, and clusters of larger institutional, educational and religious buildings.
- 8.15.12 The Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area was designated 13th July 1998. The appraisal states that in this area the High Road is at its busiest and most divisive, and the busy junctions with Broad Lane and Seven Sisters Road have a significant influence on the area's character. In addition, the main entrances to the Seven Sisters Underground Station on either side of the High Road add considerably to the volume of pedestrian traffic in this area. Much of this stretch of the High Road is lined with terraced dwellings, which are set back from the Road behind screens of vegetation. This arrangement helps to temper the dominance of the High Road and its heavy traffic. This is most apparent at the southern end of the area where mature London Plane trees screen the properties on Page Green Terrace from the High Road. Conversely, the northern end of the conservation area is dominated by the long unadorned façade to of the Tesco building, which has an imposing impact on the streetscene due to it size and proximity to the edge of the pavement.
- 8.15.13 The appraisal also identifies each building within the Conservation Area and determines whether their contribution is positive, neutral or negative. The table below identifies the buildings on the application site and briefly summarises their contribution.

Building	Contribution	Comments
227 High road (Locally listed)	Positive	- 3-storey former Wards Store - large picture windows

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - decorative cast iron framework - vacant and in poor state of repair
229-245 (odd) High Road	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -19thC red brick terrace - later modifications resulted in utilitarian and run down appearance - poorly designed modern shopfronts
247-249 High Road	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -19thC red brick terrace but with later modifications
251-253 High Road	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -19thC red brick terrace - semi-derelict due to fire damage
255-259 (odd) High Road	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preserved 19thC red brick terrace
1a-1b West Green Road (Locally listed)	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -large plate glass windows supported by cast iron framework - balustraded parapet

Applicant's appraisal

- 8.15.14 Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires the applicant to describe significance of assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting, in order to understand the impact of the development on these assets.
- 8.15.15 The applicant appointed David Lewis, an expert in conservation and restoration of listed and historic buildings, to provide a detailed assessment of the significance of the Conservation Area as a heritage asset. His statement forms part of the application.
- 8.15.16 The statement takes a broadly similar view to the Council's appraisal in that it emphasises that the character of the Conservation Area has been substantially determined by the High Road and the impact of changing transport requirements, land use, social structures and retail facilities. However, the appraisal diverges from the Council's by including the contribution of 20th C buildings and those which are just outside the Conservation Area boundary in the assessment. This is in line with paragraph 128 of the NPPF which states the importance of considering the setting of a conservation area. The submitted statement concludes that the Conservation Area is not now generally characterised by consistency of architectural or townscape style, appearance or quality but is dominated and

seriously damaged by the highway structure and its engineering and to a lesser extent the Underground Station.

- 8.15.17 In respect of the buildings present on the application site, the statement takes a more detailed and critical view. The statement demonstrates that the Wards Corner building was built prior to the appearance of curtain walls and that the construction is not steel framed but of traditional masonry construction common to retail buildings and repeated throughout the country. Furthermore, the building has been substantially altered and lost significant elements of its original design which further detracts from any significance it had.
- 8.15.18 The terrace formed by 229 to 259 High Road has also been seriously compromised by alterations and poor quality shopfronts to the extent that the strength of the terrace has been lost as only certain properties have been better preserved than others.
- 8.15.19 No.'s 1A and 1B West Green are considered to be in the same style as the Wards Corner Building but with better preserved architectural integrity. Nevertheless, in the same way as the Ward Corner building, the design is not considered unique and not related to curtain wall construction.
- 8.15.20 The heritage statement concludes that where buildings on site have some architectural interest, the interest is not unique and in any case has been seriously compromised. Apart from 1A and 1B where a small positive contribution is acknowledged, the buildings on site are considered to provide neutral contribution only.

Degree of Harm

- 8.15.21 The degree of harm is determined from the impact of the demolition of all buildings on site on the significance of the Conservation Area as a single heritage asset. Although there is disagreement between the Council and the independent appraisal over the qualities of individual buildings in the conservation area, there is broad agreement that its character stems from the High Road and the character of the buildings which developed in response.
- 8.15.22 Given the overall character of the Conservation Area, it is considered that the demolition of these buildings, while entailing the loss of some architectural interest, would not harm the character and significance of the Conservation Area as a whole to the extent that "substantial harm" is caused as set out in the NPPF. This is because firstly, the Seven Sisters/Page Green Conservation Area is not characterised by a uniformity of style, quality or appearance and therefore demolition of these buildings would have no significant impact in this sense; secondly demolition would not undermine the essential contribution the High Road and the associated street

pattern and layout of development makes to the character of the Conservation Area.

- 8.15.23 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.
- 8.15.24 As discussed in more detail in sections 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.8, the proposed development responds to a strong policy context for redevelopment, delivers substantial physical and economic regeneration as well as provides a development at a density which secures the optimum viable use of this highly accessible site.
- 8.15.25 English Heritage has objected to the scheme and argues that “substantial harm” will be caused to the conservation area due to the loss of the buildings on site which are considered to provide a positive contribution to the conservation area. As such, they argue that justification against NPPF paragraph 133 is required.
- 8.15.26 Under paragraph 133, where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, *or* all of the following apply:
- the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
 - no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
 - conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
 - the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- 8.15.27 Although officers do not agree that “substantial harm” will be caused, it is considered that the substantial public benefits of the scheme do outweigh that harm, thereby satisfying the test under paragraph 133.
- 8.15.28 The test under paragraph 133 requires the development to meet the 4 criteria above. Although the development is not required to meet this test the applicants have submitted a report which considers

variations of the scheme that retain one or more of the existing locally listed buildings on the site. The report refers to a financial appraisal undertaken by Drivers Jonas Deloitte (DJD) which concludes that 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 and retain one or more of the buildings. The DJD report has been submitted to DVS for independent assessment and its conclusions will be reported to the Planning Sub-committee.

- 8.15.29 Following the applicants' consideration of various conservation based schemes, officers consider the public benefit provided by this scheme could not otherwise be delivered if the buildings were retained.
- 8.15.30 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.
- 8.15.31 Although English Heritage have objected to the demolition of the site and the proposed design, it is officers' view that the current application responds to the above reason for refusal by providing a more thorough assessment of the significance of the affected heritage asset in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF and a more detailed appraisal of the economic benefits of the scheme. It is therefore considered that the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the harm to the Conservation Area as the "designated heritage asset" is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal, in accordance with the NPPF.
- 8.15.32 The demolition of the buildings on site provides an opportunity for a development that better engages with the dominance and intensity of the High Road, thereby reinforcing the pattern of activity which has come to characterise this Conservation Area. This is discussed in more detail in the following section 'Design'.

8.16 Design

- 8.16.1 One of the two reasons for refusal for the previous scheme was related to bulk, massing and design in relation to the Conservation Area. The reason is set out below:

- The proposed development by virtue of its bulk massing and design neither preserves nor enhances the historic character and appearance of the Tottenham High Road Corridor / Seven Sisters / Page Green Conservation Area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of National Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Creating Sustainable Communities (2005); PPS 5, Policies UD3 'General Principles' & UD4 'Quality Design' and CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Haringey UDP.
- 8.16.2 Since the determination of that application the national planning policy context with the new NPPF sets out the over-arching policy for design. Paragraph 60 states that planning decisions
- “should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular taste and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”
- 8.16.3 In addition, paragraph 61 states that high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations and that planning decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.
- 8.16.4 The proposed scheme is the product of a long development process which received input from the GLA, English Heritage, CABI, Haringey Council Planning, Haringey Design Panel and more recently the design advisor to the Tottenham Taskforce. Like the previous scheme, the current proposal responds to the severe constraints placed on the site by the Underground tunnels and the right-to-light requirements of surrounding buildings. As a result, the overall layout of the building on plan is similar to that previously proposed. However, in response to the above reasons for refusal a number of revisions were made to key elements of the scheme.
- 8.16.5 The height and bulk of the building has been reduced by removing a storey from the highest element of the scheme. This part of the building at the corner of High Road and West Green Road was eight storeys but is now seven. In addition, the detailing of the elevations has been simplified so that above the brickwork parapet the upper storeys are completely in glass panelling. The resulting effect is that the building is physically lower but it also has diminished impression of bulk on the High Road frontage due to the greater contrast between the brick face of the lower floors and the glass finish of the penthouse levels. This contrast strengthens the parapet's effect of finishing the building at a certain height with the upper floor receding

behind. The previous design had cladding on the upper storeys which gave it a more towering appearance.

- 8.16.6 Significant revisions have been made on the corner of Seven Sisters Road and High Road. Where before there was a prominent contemporary feature treatment on the corner elevation, there is now a seamless sweep curve around the corner connecting the Seven Sisters and High Road frontages. By having the elevation continue around the corner instead of interrupting it with a corner feature, emphasis is placed on the public square as the focus of the development. Having the whole building sweep in this manner reflects the importance of the orientation of the High Road. In this way, the building acts as a gateway by responding to the dominance of the junction and the historic street pattern.
- 8.16.7 The connection to London street architecture is strengthened by the revisions to the shop fronts and elevations. Previously, the shopfronts were framed in steel but are now framed by brick piers between each unit. This gives each shopfront a more traditional brick character and increases the vertical delineation between each unit. This is more in keeping with the tradition of London street architecture. On the upper floors, zinc cladding panels have been replaced with recessed brick panels again to strengthen the links to traditional London street architecture.
- 8.16.8 Seven clipped hornbeam trees have been added to the public square and the previously proposed seven trees will be realigned with the High Road. The hornbeams maintain the vertical delineation given to the brick shopfronts but in a lighter way to better suit the curved glass wall fronting the public square. The seven trees aligned with the High Road recall the set of trees that once existed here and provides a screen between the public space and the High Road. This layout also continues the prominent pattern London Plane trees that run south along the High Road to the railway bridge. In this way, the development seeks to revive the tree-lined avenue character the High Road once had. Further greenery is provided new green roofs and climbing plants on the south facing elevation of the north east block.
- 8.16.9 The station entrances and adjoining kiosks have been redesigned to include two 'Memory Boxes'. These Memory Boxes are displays that incorporate the distinctive window frames and decorative mouldings of the former Wards Store. These will frame permanent display panels containing a history of the area illustrated with drawings and period photographs. These Memory Boxes make clear the site's historical importance and preserves the most distinctive elements of the former Wards Store building. By combining the Memory Boxes with the kiosks and Underground entrances, the site's history is

brought explicitly into the public realm and addresses a particular requirement of the Development Brief to “reflect, and retain, the architectural features of the store, if at all possible”.

- 8.16.10 The Suffield road elevation has been amended so that the previous timber and white render treatment is replaced by a brick faced treatment with smaller openings. This gives this elevation a more vertical and residential feel more in keeping with surrounding traditional development. Although it is outside the Conservation Area, Suffield Road forms contributes to its setting and the NPPF identifies the influence of settings on the significance of a heritage asset. As such, the improvements on Suffield Road also serve to improve the scheme’s impact on the Conservation Area.
- 8.16.11 The revisions individually seek to improve certain elements of the scheme but together they comprise a different approach to the relating the scheme to the Conservation Area. By removing the corner feature, emphasising the public square, using the language of London street architecture to inform the design of the elevations and by explicitly presenting the history of the site through the Memory Boxes, the scheme has a more direct engagement with the Conservation Area as characterised by the historic street layout and pattern of activity at this major transport junction.
- 8.16.12 This simpler and more direct response to the site better justifies the size and bulk of the building. By being taller than existing development, the scheme successfully manages the dominance and proximity of two major road junctions by providing tall anchors at West Green Road and Seven Sisters Road and balances this massing with a public space in the middle that is sheltered from these junctions and the dominance of the High Road.
- 8.16.13 The revised scheme was presented to the Haringey Design Panel in May 2012. There was acknowledgement that the site was suited to significant redevelopment but was severely constrained by the Underground tunnels. The general concept of the public square and the design of the podium was supported. Given the location within a Conservation Area, the Panel emphasised the need for a high quality, landmark building. Concern was expressed about the simplified approach to the elevations with a more intricate and detailed approach suggested. There was also concern about how the two corner buildings related to the lower building enclosing the square with perhaps the corner buildings being too high. Furthermore, the use of glass on for the penthouse floors and their massing was questioned.

- 8.16.14 In their objection, English Heritage have stated that whilst there has been improvement to the scheme and that the development may offer other economic benefits, the scale and form of the new development is not considered to preserve or enhance the defined character of the conservation area.
- 8.16.15 Following public consultation, a significant number of local residents in addition to some resident groups have objected to the scheme on grounds that its design, bulk, height and massing is out of keeping and character with the Conservation Area and fails to preserve or enhance its historic character.
- 8.16.16 Officers have noted the comments of the Design Panel and the content of the objections however the revised scheme is considered to be of a sound design. The building is considered to an appropriate size for this location, reinforcing its positive qualities as a major interchange but also addressing its negative qualities of poor quality environment, clutter and lack of quality public space and poor sense of destination. Informed by the Heritage Statement, the building it is considered to be designed more sensitively with regard to the Conservation Area. It has a more direct engagement with the bustling character of this part of the High Road and at the same time, it preserves the legacy of the former Wards Store in a viable way that is more evident than the corner feature proposed in the previous scheme.
- 8.16.17 The scheme is considered to be of a quality design which enhances the character of the conservation area by having a bulk, massing and design which is commensurate to the location and sympathetic to the architectural language of the area. In accordance with NPPF policy, the scheme reinforces local distinctiveness and addresses the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the built historic environment.
- 8.16.18 The revised scheme is therefore considered to be sufficiently different from the refused scheme and in a way which addresses the earlier reason for refusal and having regard to the NPPF and Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design' and CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas' of the Haringey UDP.

8.17 Community Safety

- 8.17.1 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.

- 8.17.2 The previous and current schemes were 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 portage / 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. A barrier operated by a key given to those entitled to use those spaces will limit access to the residential car park.
- 8.17.3 In their consultation response of May 2012, the Metropolitan Police stated that they have no objection to the scheme and have been working with the architect since inception to achieve full Secure by Design Accreditation. 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'.
- 8.17.4 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.

8.18 Daylight and Sunlight

- 8.18.1 The applicants have submitted a daylight 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. The report assesses all properties for compliance with the BRE guidelines in relation to daylight and sunlight.
- 8.18.2 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.

- 8.18.3 The above assessment was undertaken on the previous design however as the current design is lower in height, there will be an even smaller impact on neighbouring properties.

8.19 Traffic and Parking

- 8.19.1 National Planning Policy seeks to reduce the dependence on the private car in urban areas such as Haringey. This advice is also reflected in the London Plan. 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. Policy M5 seeks to protect and improve pedestrian and cycle routes. The transport impact of the proposed development has been assessed by the Council's Transport and Highways Group and Transport for London. Both have no objection subject to appropriate conditions and s106/s278 obligations.
- 8.19.2 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. Accordingly, the majority of the scheme is 'car-free'. However, 44 car parking spaces are proposed in the basement to compensate for the loss of the existing 48 car parking spaces on the site and to 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 surrounding CPZ. TfL have requested the provision of electric vehicle charging points be secured by condition.
- 8.19.3 196 secure cycle spaces are provided, 1 for each residential unit, however TfL have requested that 234 cycle spaces are provided for the residential component and 11 for the commercial component, in line with London Plan 2011 standards. Public cycle racks will also be provided in the public square on High Road near the entrances to the Underground station.
- 8.19.4 It is considered that the existing public transport infrastructure has sufficient capacity to deal with extra demand created by the proposed development. TfL have requested improvements to the four local bus stops occur as part of the development.

- 8.19.5 Servicing will occur from Suffield Road. Since the previous application was determined, Suffield Road has become one-way. However, the Councils Transportation Group have proposed that the southern end of Suffield Street is returned to 2-way traffic to allow for service vehicles to safely access the site, with the street north of the access point remaining one-way.
- 8.19.6 For the pedestrian environment, 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. This would cater for the increased pedestrian activities expected at this location. TfL have requested that improvements are informed by a detailed review of the pedestrian environment.
- 8.19.7 The applicants have agreed to submit a travel plan for both the residential and commercial components. Proposed measures will include 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.

8.20 Inclusive Design

- 8.20.1 UDP Policy UD3 “General Principles” and SPG 4 “Access for All – Mobility Standards” seek to ensure that there is access to and around the site and that the mobility needs of pedestrians, cyclists and people with difficulties. In addition, the London Plan requires all new development to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion; to exceed the minimum requirements of the Building Regulations and to ensure from the outset that the design process takes all potential users of the proposed places and spaces into consideration, including disabled and deaf people, older people, children and young people.
- 8.20.2 The design takes note of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, Building Regulations Part M and Haringey Housing SPD and SPG4 in ensuring inclusive access. Tactile paving will mark pedestrian crossings and dropped kerbs will make it easier for wheelchairs and pushchairs to cross. Access to all shops, the restaurant, café and residential units will be level with a lift access provided for all floors. 10% of the residential units will be fully wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for wheelchair use in accordance with the Haringey Housing SPD.

8.21 Sustainability and Energy

- 8.21.1 The NPPF emphasises the planning system's key role in helping shape places to secure radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimising vulnerability and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change, and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. Chapter 5 of the London Plan 2011 sets out the approach to climate change and requires developments to make the fullest contribution to minimizing carbon dioxide emissions. The energy strategy for the development has been developed using the Mayor's 'lean, clean, green' energy hierarchy.
- 8.21.2 The applicant is proposing the application of energy efficiency ('lean'), Combined Heat and Power Plan ('clean') and renewable energy provided by 220 sqm of photovoltaics ('green'). 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.
- 8.21.3 The development will also achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.

8.22 Archaeology

- 8.22.1 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.

8.23 Contamination

- 8.23.1 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.

8.24 Air Quality

- 8.24.1 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.
- 8.24.2 The assessment concludes that the extra traffic associated with the development will not significantly affect air quality.
- 8.24.3 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.
- 8.24.4 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.

8.25 Drainage

- 8.25.1 The majority of the site comprises 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.

8.26 Noise and Vibration

- 8.26.1 The NPPF states that the planning system should prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of noise pollution. 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.
- 8.26.2 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.

8.27 Environmental Impact Assessment

8.27.1 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 (LPA) 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.

8.27.2 The LPA first issued a screening opinion on the need for an Environmental Impact Assessment in relation to the previous scheme in 2007 and subsequently issued a second screening opinion during its re-determination in 2011. In both instances it was considered 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.

8.28 For the current scheme, the LPA considered the need for an EIA and have concluded that again an EIA is not required. This is due to the fact that the size of the development has been reduced and no other changes have been made which would affect its environmental impact.

8.29 Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

8.30 The development is liable to the Mayoral CIL of £35 per sqm. For this development, the CIL liable is £524,160.

8.31 Planning Obligations/s106 Agreement

8.31.1 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.

8.31.2 Since the previous application was determined, the introduction of the Mayoral CIL has placed a significant financial burden on the scheme and due to the high cost of development on this site and its associated impact on viability, there has been a reduction in some elements of the s106 contributions in financial terms. These are summarised below:

- Removal of £200k education contribution
- No voluntary payment paid to traders equivalent to that under the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954
- West Green Road improvement fund reduced from £250k to £150k

8.31.3 All other s106 contributions proposed under the previous scheme are retained. These are described below.

Indoor Market

8.31.4 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 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;

8.31.5 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.

8.31.6 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.

- 8.31.7 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

- 8.31.8 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

- 8.31.9 The applicant offers to contribute £150,000 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

- 8.31.10 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

- 8.31.11 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.
- 8.31.12 The Council as Housing Authority shall offer appropriate assistance to shorthold (i.e. private tenants) and owner occupiers to locate to alternative suitable properties
- 8.31.13 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.
- 8.31.14 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).
- 8.31.15 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

- 8.31.16 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.
- 8.31.17 In this case the Local Planning Authority recognises that the costs of bringing the scheme forward are exceptional. 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 and that with additional burden of the Mayoral CIL (£524,160), it has been demonstrated that a contribution is not financially viable. 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 that in these exceptional circumstances an education contribution is not required.

Memory Boxes

- 8.31.18 The 'Memory Boxes' as described in the planning documents shall be provided in the public realm.

Public Realm

- 8.31.19 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.

Suffield Road

- 8.31.20 Works to Suffield Road will be required to return part of it to 2-way traffic to facilitate servicing to the development. This will be secured through a s.278 agreement.

Local Employment

- 8.31.21 Provisions will be made to ensure that the recruitment, employment, training and career development arrangements of all contractors and occupiers of the Development reflect the principles and objectives of the Haringey Guarantee Programme;
- 8.31.22 The applicant will use reasonable endeavours to procure that its contractors target the offer of employment 20 individuals (who immediately prior to such employment live in the Tottenham Area) on an apprentice basis during the construction phase of the Development and to liaise with the College of Haringey to secure the offer of those apprenticeship places;
- 8.31.23 Work with the Council to implement measures that aim to secure that all of the new jobs within the development (during construction and following Occupation) are made available in the first instance to residents of the borough of Haringey and to agree with the Council a mechanism for advertising such jobs;
- 8.31.24 Work with the Council to support measures that promote the Tottenham Area as an area for business and the services provided by local businesses;
- 8.31.25 Advertise supply chain opportunities arising from the Development to local businesses in the borough of Haringey; and

Other elements

8.31.26 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
- 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

8.31.27 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.

8.32 Greater London Authority (GLA)

8.32.1 The GLA's Stage 1 report will be issued and reported to the Planning Committee as an addendum. However, it should be noted that the GLA supported to the previous scheme.

9.0 HUMAN RIGHTS

- 9.1 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 where there is a requirement to give reasons for the grant of planning permission. Reasons for refusal are always given and are set out on the decision notice. Unless any report specifically indicates otherwise all decision of this Committee will accord with the requirements of the above Act and Order.

10.0 EQUALITIES

- 10.1 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
- 10.2 The new duty covers the following eight protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. Public authorities also need to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination against someone because of their marriage or civil partnership status.
- 10.3 For the previous scheme, the Council commissioned URS 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.
- 10.4 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. The Council again commissioned URS to conduct an EqlA for the revised scheme. An updated assessment was made on this basis and the report is attached at Appendix 7. The updated assessment includes the results of a face-to-face survey of affected residents and

business owners.

- 10.5 The assessment considered the potential impacts arising from the planning application for affected people sharing these protected characteristics. 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 6.
- 10.6 The earlier report informed the package of mitigation offered in the s106 agreement.
- 10.7 The updated report concludes that the development brings positive and negative equalities impacts and provided that all the measures set out in the S106 agreement are honoured in full and in a timely manner, many of the negative impacts can be mitigated. The assessment recognises concerns expressed by objectors concerning potential impacts and the concerns of those interviewed particularly in relation to market traders and business. The assessment states there is a potential risk of negative equalities impacts on businesses residents if the proposed measures do not adequately mitigate the identified negative impacts.
- 10.8 The development no longer provides an education contribution due to issues of viability following the introduction of the Mayoral CIL (see section 8.14). Without this contribution the development gives rise to a negative equality impact affecting school-aged children.
- 10.9 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. High levels of new affordable housing provision in South Tottenham goind forward separately are considered to provide appropriate wider mitigation for this negative impact.
- 10.10 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.
- 10.11 In their Stage I report of June 2011 in respect of the previous scheme, the GLA stated 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 (see Appendix 8). The GLA's updated Stage 1 report will be reported to Planning Sub-Committee.

- 10.12 The equalities impact of the scheme has been duly considered in accordance with the Council's statutory duties under the Equality Act 2010. As was the case under the previous scheme, in the officers' view that, on balance, the scheme brings both positive and equalities impacts and where they are negative, that the proposed mitigations measures are sufficient or are balanced by the wider positive regeneration impacts of the scheme.

11.0 PREDETERMINATION

- 11.1 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.

12.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

- 12.1 The application site is located on the west side of Tottenham High Road. It is above Seven Sisters Underground Station and tunnels and contains the former Wards Corner Store as well as mixed commercial and residential Victorian development. The site is identified in planning policy and the planning brief as a key regeneration site.
- 12.2 It 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.
- 12.3 The application is a revised version of a previous proposal which was refused on grounds that (1) its bulk massing and design would neither preserve or enhance the historic character and appearance of the Conservation Area; and (2) that it would constitute "substantial harm" to Heritage Assets with insufficient justification by the applicant that the development will deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm.

- 12.4 The scheme addresses the first reason for refusal by amending certain elements of the design and it is considered that it is of a high quality design which enhances the character of the conservation area by having a bulk, massing and design commensurate to character and intensity of activity in this location and sympathetic to the architectural language of the area while retaining the legacy of the Wards Store building through the 'Memory Boxes'.
- 12.5 In respect of the second reason, the significance of the Conservation Area as a single "heritage asset" has been assessed and it is considered that demolition of all buildings on site, while entailing the loss of some buildings of architectural interest, would not result in "substantial harm". Rather, the "less than substantial harm" is considered to be outweighed by the significant physical and economic regeneration benefits of the scheme.
- 12.6 The development will deliver the 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 substantial number of new dwellings including the provision of family housing built to modern standards; quality amenity space and children's play space; 'Memory Boxes' to commemorate the site's history, improvements to the public realm including a new public square and improvements to West Green Road.
- 12.7 The building 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.
- 12.8 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 have been consented to elsewhere in the east of the borough.
- 12.9 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 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.

- 12.10 The detailed assessments outlined in this report demonstrate that on balance there is strong planning policy support for these proposals embodied in the Local Development Plan and backed by Regional and National Planning Guidance. Therefore, subject to appropriate conditions and s106 contributions the application should be approved.

13.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

a) GRANT PERMISSION subject to:

- conditions set out below
- a legal agreement under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- the direction of the Mayor of London; and
- in accordance with the approved plans and documents in the tables below

b) GRANT CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT subject to:

- a condition set out below; and
- in accordance with the approved plans and documents in the tables below

DOCUMENTS
Title
Planning Statement
Heritage Statement
Consultation Statement
Management Strategy Report
Energy Strategy
Daylight and Sunlight Report Jan 2008
Noise and Vibration Exposure Assessment Jan 2008
Structural Engineering Report Jan 2008
Contamination Survey October 2007
Economic Impact Assessment
Archaeological Desk Bound Assessment
Construction Management Report
Transport Assessment
Equality Impact Assessment

Plan Number	Plan Title
10153/F/01-01	Survey Drawings

8444/T/01A-06	
8444/T 02A-06	
8444/T 03A-06	
8444/T 04A-06	
8444/T 05A-06	
8444/T 06A-06	
P(00)21B	Site Plan
P(00)00A	Basement Floor
P(00) 01E	Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 02C	Upper Ground Floor Plan
P(00) 03C	First Floor Plan
P(00) 04C	Second Floor Plan
P(00) 05B	Third Floor Plan
P(00) 06B	Fourth Floor Plan
P(00) 07C	Fifth & Gallery level Floor Plan
P(00) 08C	Sixth Floor Plan
P(00)10B	Roof Plan
P(00)100D	Tottenham. High Road and Seven Sisters Road
P(00)101C	Suffield and West Green Road + Int. Corner
P(00)102D	West Green, Suffield + 7 Seven Sisters Detail Elevations
P(00)110C	Elevational Site Sections AA BB and CC
P(00)111D	Elevational Site Section DD and EE
P(00)112A	Kiosk Plans and Elevations

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

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

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.

Landscaping

14. Notwithstanding the details of landscaping referred to in the application, a scheme for the landscaping and treatment of the surroundings of the proposed development to include detailed drawings of:

- a. those existing trees to be retained.
- b. those existing trees to be removed.
- c. those existing trees which will require thinning, pruning, pollarding or lopping as a result of this consent. All such work to be agreed with the Council's Arboriculturalist.
- d. Those new trees and shrubs to be planted together with a schedule of species shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. Such an approved scheme of planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out and implemented in strict accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the building or the completion of development (whichever is sooner). Any trees or plants, either existing or proposed, which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, become damaged or

diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with a similar size and species. The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be maintained and retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order for the Local Authority to assess the acceptability of any landscaping scheme in relation to the site itself, thereby ensuring a satisfactory setting for the proposed development in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Landscape/playspace Management

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

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

Environmental Management Plan/Air Quality Assessment

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

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

Lifetime Homes

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

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

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

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

Noise

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

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

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

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

Cycle Parking

21. That the proposed development shall provide service covered storage for 234 cycle racks for the residential units and 11 cycle racks for the commercial units, a total of 245 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

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

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

Travel Plans

23. As part of the detailed travel plan, a residential travel plan must be secured by the S.106 agreement, with the following measure to be included as part of the travel plan in order to maximise the use of public transport.

- a) The developer must appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator, working in collaboration with the Estate Management Team, to monitor the travel plan initiatives.
- b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables, to every new resident.
- c) Establishment or operate a car club scheme, which includes free first year membership for all new residents.
- d) Adequate residential cycle provision, in line with the 2011 London Plan for the residential development
- e) We will also like to see Travel Information Terminals erected at strategic points within

Reason: To minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads, and to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport.

24. A commercial travel plan must be secured by the S.106 agreement; the developer must submit the commercial/retail Travel in line with TfL Travel Plan Guidance for the commercial/retail units within six months of occupation.

Reason: To minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads, and to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport.

Servicing and Deliveries

25. The applicant/ operator are required to submit a Service and Deliver Plan (SDP) for the local authority's approval prior to occupancy of the proposed development. The Plans should provide details on how servicing and deliveries will take place including access via the service gate. It is also requested that servicing and deliveries should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce traffic and congestion on the transportation and highways network.

26. The applicant/ Developer are required to submit a construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commences on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work (including demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on A503 Seven

Sisters Road and Suffield Road is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation

Suffield Road Alterations

27. The applicant/ Developer will be required to enter into a S.278 agreement relating to the conversion of a section of Suffield Road highways between Seven Sisters Road and the development site entrance to allow vehicles to travel in both direction and for the reconstruction of the development access to the site, removal of all redundant crossovers and reconstruct the footways on Suffield Road.

Reason: To facilitate effective access to the development

Climate Change Mitigation

28. 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 5.2 and 5.3 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

29. 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 5.2 and 5.3 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

Public Realm Improvements

30. 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.

Such a scheme shall be to be informed by a Pedestrian Environmental Review System (PERS) audit of the pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the site in accordance London Plan Policy 6.10.

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

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

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

Demolition Management Plan

32. 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

33. 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 5.2 and 5.3 and UDP Policy UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction.

Green Roof

34. Notwithstanding the drawings submitted with the application, details and drawings of the proposed green roof 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 satisfactory provision of the green roof in the interests of sustainability

Piling Method Statement

35. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the details of the piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground water utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground water utility infrastructure.

Water Infrastructure

36. Development should not be commenced until Impact studies of the existing water supply infrastructure have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority (in consultation with Thames Water). The studies should determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.

Reason: To ensure that the water supply infrastructure has sufficient capacity to cope with the/this additional demand.

Electric Vehicle Charging Point

37. The applicant shall ensure that 1 in 5 parking spaces provide an electrical vehicle charging point (ECVP).

Reason: To encourage the uptake of electric vehicles in accordance with London Plan Policy 6.13.

INFORMATIVES

- A 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.
- B 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.
- C There are public sewers crossing or close to the development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.
- D There are large water mains adjacent to the proposed development. Thames Water will not allow any building within 5 metres of them and will require 24hours access for maintenance purposes. Please contact Thames Water Developer Services, Contact Centre on Telephone No: 0845 850 2777 for further information.
- E With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.
- F 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.

- G A contribution towards the interchange between rail and underground in order to widen corridors/walkways to the London Underground station may be required. TfL welcomes further discussion about this matter.

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT Condition:

1. The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been granted for the redevelopment for which the contract provides.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The reasons for the grant of planning permission are as follows:

- a) It is considered that the principle of this development is supported by National, Regional and Local Planning policies which seek to promote regeneration through housing, employment and urban improvement to support local economic growth.
- b) The development is considered to be suitably designed in respect of the Tottenham High Road Corridor / Seven Sisters / Page Green Conservation Area and the harm caused by demolition of all buildings on site including those in the Conservation Area is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits brought by the regeneration of the site.
- c) The Planning Application has been assessed against and on balance is considered to comply with the intent of the National Planning Policy Framework, Regional and Local Planning Policies requirements including London Borough of Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006, G2 'Development and Urban Design', G3 'Housing Supply', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality

Design', UD6 'Mixed Use Developments', UD9 'Locations for Tall Buildings', HSG1 'New Housing Developments', HSG4 'Affordable Housing', HSG7 'Housing for Special Needs', AC3 'Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor', M2 'Public Transport Network', M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility', M5 'Protection, Improvements and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes', M9 'Car- Free Residential Developments', M10 'Parking for Development', CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', CSV2 'Listed Buildings', CSV3 'Locally Listed Buildings and Designated Sites of Industrial Heritage Interest', CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas', EMP3 'Defined Employment Areas - Employment Locations', EMP5 'Promoting Employment Uses', ENV1 'Flood Protection: Protection of the Floodplain and Urban Washlands', ENV2 'Surface Water Runoff', ENV4 'Enhancing and Protecting the Water Environment', ENV5 'Works Affecting Watercourses', ENV6 'Noise Pollution', ENV7 'Air, Water and Light Pollution', ENV11 'Contaminated Land' and ENV13 'Sustainable Waste Management'

APPENDICES

13.1	Appendix 1:	Consultation Responses
13.2	Appendix 2:	Planning Policies
13.3	Appendix 3:	Development Management Forum Minutes
13.4	Appendix 4:	Not Used
13.5	Appendix 5:	Planning History
13.6	Appendix 6:	Summary of EqlA impacts and Proposed Responses
13.7	Appendix 7:	EqlA prepared by URS Scott Wilson
13.8	Appendix 8:	Summary of previous GLA reports
13.9	Appendix 9:	Court of Appeal Judgement
13.10	Appendix 10:	Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief

APPENDIX 1

Consultation Responses

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	STATUTORY		
1	The Mayor of London	Stage 1 report will be reported to committee.	
	Transport for London	<p>The development provides 44 car parking spaces, however no information has been provided regarding disabled spaces.</p> <p>As advised with previous applications for this site, given the high public transport accessibility level, there is an opportunity for the development to be car free.</p> <p>Electrical vehicle charging points (EVCP) should be provided in accordance with London Plan policy 6.13. This should be secured by condition.</p> <p>TfL considers the general approach to trip generation and modal split reasonable and in line with London Plan Policy 6.3 "assessing effects of development on transport capacity'. Information on the impact on rail transport should also be included.</p> <p>There should be a total of 234 and 11 cycle spaces for residential and commercial uses respectively. The proposals should also include cycle stands that are conveniently located close building entrances and provide casual spaces for visitors to the commercial uses.</p> <p>A contribution towards the interchange between rail and underground in order to widen corridors/walkways to the</p>	<p>3 disabled spaces provided</p> <p>Scheme is car-free however parking is provided for family units on Suffield Road.</p> <p>Condition applied.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Condition applied.</p> <p>Informative added.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>London Underground station may be required. TfL welcomes further discussion about this matter.</p> <p>The four nearby bus stops on Tottenham High Road, Seven Sisters Road and West Green Road should be upgraded to TfL accessibility standards. The GLA transport team welcomes further discussion on these matters.</p> <p>Additional information should be provided on who will be responsible for the monitoring and funding of the plans.. Furthermore targets must be set for the time period 3 and 5 years after occupation. TfL recommends that the travel plan is secured, funded and monitored through the s106 agreement.</p> <p>TfL request a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) is secured with the travel plan.Measures outlined in the transport assessment to manage student arrival and departures are particularly welcomed. These measures should be incorporated into the DSP.</p> <p>TfL also requests that a Construction Logistic Plan (CLP) is secured by condition. The CLP will need to identify efficient and sustainable measures that will be undertaken during construction of the development.</p>	<p>Included in conditions</p> <p>Included in Travel Plan condition</p> <p>Condition included.</p> <p>Condition Included.</p>
	Environment Agency	No objection	Noted
	English Heritage	Notwithstanding improvements to the scheme and the need for economic regeneration, the loss of a substantial part of the conservation area and its replacement with a substantial mixed-use development will cause substantial harm to the	Considered that less than substantial harm caused (see section 8.15)

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>conservation area and as such requires justification under paragraph 133 of the NPPF.</p> <p>It has not been demonstrated that the wider benefits could not be delivered by a more conservation led scheme which better preserves or enhances the significance of the conservation area</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that lack of investment, and poor quality alteration, has eroded some of the aesthetic quality of this part of the conservation area, the area retains the coherent appearance of its Victorian and Edwardian streetscape and there is little to suggest the condition of the majority of buildings prevents all reasonable uses of the site.</p> <p>Whilst it may offer other economic benefits, the scale and form of the new development is not considered to preserve or enhance the defined character of the conservation area. Nor can it be considered to enhance or better reveal its significance.</p> <p>If the local authority is minded to grant permission for the proposed development we would request that special attention is given to ensuring that the palate of materials for the new development and public realm contributes positively to the setting of the conservation area</p>	<p>Considered that the benefits are substantial and could not be delivered by a conservation led scheme (see section 8.15)</p> <p>Retaining the buildings would not deliver the benefits of the current scheme (see section 8.15)</p> <p>The development is considered to be sensitively designed and appropriate in scale to the size of the junction and surrounding development (see section 8.16)</p> <p>Condition applied.</p>
	Metropolitan Police	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. Previously been consulted with the applicant with a view to achieve full Secure by Design Accreditation.	Noted.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	London Underground	<p>We are now satisfied that the current scheme takes due account of all the constraints we had previously discussed with them in earlier schemes and thus there should be little difficulty in them satisfying us in this matter assuming suitable design development which we are assured is in hand with competent professionals.</p> <p>I would also note that the provision of canopies and kiosks around the two staircases from Tottenham High Road West side into the station whilst supported in principle may need to change in appearance to meet LU corporate identity standards.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Final design to be secured by condition.</p>
	Thames Water	<p>There are public sewers crossing or close to the development. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recommend the following condition be imposed: Development should not be commenced until: Impact studies of the existing water supply are undertaken and approved by the LPA</p> <p>No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water.</p>	<p>Informative added.</p> <p>Informative added.</p> <p>Condition added.</p> <p>Condition added.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to any planning permission: There are large water mains adjacent to the proposed development. Thames Water will not allow any building within 5 metres of them and will require 24 hours access for maintenance purposes.	Informative added.
	DESIGN PANEL	See section 7.6-7.8	See section 7.6-7.8
	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT FORUM	See section 7.3-7.4	See section 7.3-7.4
	INTERNAL		
	LBH Transportation	<p>On reviewing this development proposal we have concluded that this development proposal will be required to provide transport infrastructure improvement and travel plan measures geared towards minimising car-dependency. We believe that these measures can be achieved through planning conditions and S.106/S.278 agreement. Consequently, the highway and transportation authority would not object to this application, subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1) A residential travel plan must be secured by the S.106 agreement, as part of the detailed travel plan. We will however require the following measure to be included as part of the travel plan in order to maximise the use of public transport.</p> <p>a)The developer must appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator, working in collaboration with the Estate Management Team, to monitor the travel plan initiatives.</p> <p>b)Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Provision in s106</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>bus/rail/tube services, map and time-tables, to every new resident.</p> <p>c) Establishment or operate a car club scheme, which includes free first year membership for all new residents.</p> <p>d) Adequate residential cycle provision, in line with the 2011 London Plan for the residential development</p> <p>e) We will also like to see Travel Information Terminals erected at strategic points within development.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads, and to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>2. A commercial travel plan must be secured by the S.106 agreement; the developer must submit the commercial/retail Travel in line with TfL Travel Plan Guidance for the commercial/ retail units within six months of occupation.</p> <p>Reason: To minimise the traffic impact of this development on the adjoining roads, and to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>3) The applicant enters into a S.106 agreement to dedicate the development as a car free development. The residential unit is defined as 'car free' and therefore no residents therein will be entitled to apply for a resident's 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.</p>	<p>Provision in s106</p> <p>Provision in s106</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Reason: To mitigate the parking demand generated by the development on the local Highways Network and to reduce car ownership and trips generated by car, and increase travel by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>4) The applicant/ Developer are required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commences on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work (including demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on A503 Seven Sisters Road and Suffield Road is minimised. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation</p> <p>5) The applicant/ operator are required to submit a Service and Deliver Plan (SDP) for the local authority's approval prior to occupancy of the proposed development. The Plans should provide details on how servicing and deliveries will take place including access via the service gate. It is also requested that servicing and deliveries should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce traffic and congestion on the transportation and highways network.</p> <p>6). The applicant/ Developer will be required to contribute by</p>	<p>Provision in s106</p> <p>Provision in s106</p> <p>Provision in s106</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>way of a S.106 agreement £150,000 (one hundred and fifty thousand) for environmental improvements within the local area surrounding the site, in particular West Green Road.</p> <p>Reason: To provide enhance walking and cycling facilities in order to promote travel by sustainable modes of transport to and from the site.</p> <p>7). The applicant/ Developer will be required to enter into a S.278 agreement relating to the conversion of a section of Suffield Road highways between Seven Sisters Road and the development site entrance to allow vehicles to travel in both direction and for the reconstruction of the development access to the site, removal of all redundant crossovers and reconstruct the footways on Suffield Road</p> <p>Reason: To facilitate effective access to the development</p> <p>8). In relation to the proposed landscaping of the section of footway on Seven Sisters Road, the developer will be required to submit the detailed design, including materials to the Highways authority for approval.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the transportation and highways network.</p>	<p>Condition applied</p> <p>Condition applied</p>
	LBh Environmental Health Food, Health and Safety	No objection	Noted.
	EXTERNAL GROUPS		
	Tottenham CAAC Tottenham Civic Society	Although reduced by one storey the proposed building is 6 storeys in an area of mainly 3-storey buildings. At more than twice the height of surrounding buildings it will tower over	The height of the building is considered to be appropriate to the character of the site at a major junction (see section 8.16). Daylight and sunlight study shows no harmful

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>them and cast shadows over them.</p> <p>The proposed building will be a continuous block from Seven Sisters Road to West Green Road and will be out of character in its bulk and massing with the rest of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The design is bland and characterless and would not preserve or enhance the conservation area. It is not the high quality landmark building required by the development brief</p> <p>The loss of heritage buildings, especially the landmark locally listed Wards Corner buildings would destroy the historic character of the area. It will also create big gap in the High Road Historic Corridor and conflicts with the Council's policy for the High Road as a whole</p> <p>The proposed development will add considerably to the population density in the area but will not remove an individuals or families from the Housing List which is badly needed</p> <p>Independent businesses and small traders displaced by the proposed development will not be able to return as increased rents are inevitable. There is no alternative place for them</p> <p>It is very unlikely that significant numbers of local people would be employed either in the construction of the proposed development or in the national chains of shops the developer</p>	<p>overshadowing (see section 8.18)</p> <p>The massing is broken up into smaller forms with a break in the frontage for the public square. Development is lower on Suffield Road side in accordance with the lower residential development. (see section 8.16)</p> <p>The design is simpler, modern form of London street architecture. The development is considered to enhance the CA by matching the dominance of the High Road. (see section 8.16)</p> <p>The character of the Conservation Area as a whole is preserved. The building engages with the High Road in a positive way with public realm and street planting (see section 8.16).</p> <p>Significant amount of affordable housing delivered elsewhere in the east of Haringey. Affordable housing not viable on this site (see sections 8.13 and 8.14)</p> <p>Units on West Green Road will be for smaller independent business with tenancies subject to Council approval. Businesses will receive support through s106 to help them manage displacement and potential return (see sections 8.5, 8.6 and 8.28)</p> <p>S106 has clauses to ensure employment opportunities from construction and operation are offered to Haringey residents (see section 8.28)</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>hopes to attract</p> <p>The proposal is extremely unlikely to create any regeneration of the area and will result in continued blight and vacant shop units like in other areas of Tottenham</p> <p>The future of the site lies in refurbishing Wards Corner, which is basically in sound condition, and having an imaginative scheme which can build on the independent businesses thriving there despite the recession, the riots and the deliberate policy of the council, TfL and Grainger to allow the properties on site to fall into decay.</p>	<p>The increase in retail floor area reflects the space added that is suitable for national multiple retailers. Smaller units are provided for existing retailers or similar to occupy the site, as they do now (see section 8.5).</p> <p>Refurbishing Wards Corner will not provide the wider regeneration benefits of the current scheme (see sections 8.4 and 8.15).</p>
	Friends of the Earth	<p>No pre-application consultation</p> <p>Scheme is too similar to the refuse scheme</p> <p>The changes to the scheme do not address the reasons for refusal</p> <p>Does not accord with NPPF paragraph 23 requiring the retention of the market</p> <p>Does not accord with NPPF paragraph 131 requiring positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness</p>	<p>The applicant carried out extensive consultation for the first scheme and consultation was considered necessary for the revised scheme (see section 7.0)</p> <p>The differences apply to key elements of the scheme which are considered to address the reasons for refusal (see section 8.16)</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The market will be temporarily relocated and re-provided in the new development (see section 8.6)</p> <p>The design is considered to satisfy paragraph 131 (see section 8.17)</p>
	Tottenham and Wood	The development should be built to zero carbon or	The energy efficiency of the building meets London Plan

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	Green Friends of the Earth	<p>passivhaus standards</p> <p>Question the lack of solar PV</p> <p>The roof should be a green roof where PV is not viable</p> <p>The scheme should be car-free with only disabled and car club space. Electric charging points should be fitted</p>	<p>Policy</p> <p>Solar PV is included</p> <p>Scheme included green roofs</p> <p>Scheme is car-free except for residents on Suffield Road. Car club and electric vehicle charging points are included</p>
	LOCAL RESIDENTS/BUSINESSES		
	69 responses have been received in objection as of 12:00h 15/06/2012	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>The building is still too large, incongruous, bland and not in keeping with the conservation area</p> <p>The design quality is not high enough to merit demolition and is not a landmark development</p> <p>The design was not subject to a RIBA competition</p> <p>The massing of the penthouse floors is cluttered</p> <p>Material will not be of a sufficiently high quality</p> <p>The scheme is too similar to the previous scheme</p> <p>Overshadowing to surrounding properties</p> <p>London underground have objected</p>	<p>Design is considered appropriate to site and brief given the context of the conservation area (see sections 8.15 and 8.16)</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Design was subject to extensive input from CABE, LBH, GLA and Tottenham Task force</p> <p>The stepped-back massing reduces the sense of bulk of the proposal (see section 8.16)</p> <p>Materials subject to further approval</p> <p>Scheme has key differences to previous scheme (see section 8.16)</p> <p>No harmful overshadowing. See section 8.18</p> <p>LUL have withdrawn their objection</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p><u>Market/Retail/Economy</u></p> <p>Existing businesses should be supported in their current form</p> <p>The retail units will be unaffordable to local traders</p> <p>The retail units will be not be let</p> <p>The retail units will not support local character and will not complete with other local centres</p> <p>The economic benefits are uncertain. Local employment will be temporary</p> <p>Loss of the market</p> <p>The existing character of the market will not be retained and will be a loss to the Latin-American community</p> <p>The market will be restricted to A1 use which is not suitable for the market to operate as it does now</p>	<p>Although displacement will occur, business will receive support to move and potentially return to the size. See section 8.28</p> <p>Units on West Green Road are for local independent retailers. See sections 8.5 and 8.28</p> <p>Units are designed to modern specification and provide space not currently provided. This will attract new retailers. There is interest from national multiples in the area (eg. Sainsburys).</p> <p>Units on West Green Road are for local independent retailers and market will be reprovided. Latin American identity will be promoted See sections 8.5, 8.6 and 8.28</p> <p>Applicant required to work with Council to ensure permanent job opportunities are provided to local residents. See section 8.28</p> <p>Market will be re-provided at equivalent per-stall size. Provisions in place for temporary relocation</p> <p>Latin American identity will be promoted in new market</p> <p>Rent will be at A1 rate but café and restaurant spaces available</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>If insufficient interest for the market is shown, the applicant will not have to build it</p> <p>The replacement market stalls are too small</p> <p>Jobs provided will only be temporary or low skilled</p> <p><u>Conservation</u></p> <p>Removes a significant portion of traditional buildings of historic character</p> <p>The buildings on site are of architectural and historic merit. Demolition of the buildings would harm the conservation area and the policy tests are not met</p> <p>The submitted heritage statement is inaccurate/incorrect</p> <p>The Wards store and other buildings should be refurbished rather than demolished. They remain in sound condition</p> <p>The Memory Boxes are an inadequate approach to heritage preservation</p> <p>Redevelopment is needed but in a more conservation led way</p> <p><u>Consultation/Process</u></p>	<p>The s106 requires the market be provided as per the submitted drawings, subject to conditions</p> <p>The units are equivalent in size with the existing stalls</p> <p>Permanent jobs will be provided by the occupant businesses. Larger retailers can provide career paths to higher positions</p> <p>See section 8.15</p> <p>See section 8.15</p> <p>Officers have taken their own view on heritage. See section 8.15</p> <p>The retention of the buildings and delivery of regeneration benefits of the scheme is not viable. See section 8.15 'Conservation'.</p> <p>The memory boxes retain the most distinctive feature of the Wards Store building. See section 8.16</p> <p>The retention of the buildings and delivery of regeneration benefits of the scheme is not viable. See section 8.15 'Conservation'.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>Applicant consultation has been inadequate and not best practice</p> <p>No Certificate of Ownership submitted</p> <p>Perceived bias in favour of the proposal by the Council</p> <p>Submission of this application while the refused application is subject to appeal is inconsiderate of local democracy and opinion</p> <p><u>Equalities/Community</u></p> <p>The EqIA notes that BME businesses will be disproportionately affected. The Council must consider this finding seriously</p> <p>Loss of café bar and indoor market would harm availability of social spaces</p> <p>Loss of the market, business and homes will harm the community and destabilise community cohesion</p> <p><u>Housing/Intensity of development</u></p>	<p>The applicant carried out extensive consultation for the first scheme and consultation was considered necessary for the revised scheme. Initial consultation was considered satisfactory by the Institute of Consultation Institute (see section 7.0)</p> <p>These have been submitted correctly. The certificate is withheld from public view as it contains personal information</p> <p>The application is considered entirely on its merits. See section 11.0</p> <p>The consideration of the current scheme and the appeal relating to the refused scheme are separate matters and it is lawful for these to run concurrently.</p> <p>The Council have commissioned an independent EqIA and the findings of which are considered in accordance with the Council's statutory duty. See section 10.0</p> <p>Market with café is re-provided</p> <p>Existing traders, businesses and residents will receive support as per the s106. See Section 8.28</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>No provision of affordable housing</p> <p>The housing will not be affordable to local people</p> <p>Dwelling mix is skewed towards smaller units</p> <p>Increased population density will add further pressure to social services</p> <p>Development should be shifted to Apex House</p> <p><u>Impact from displacement</u></p> <p>Existing residents and business will be displaced and will not be in a position to return, particularly the non-market traders</p> <p><u>Public space and facilities/safety</u></p> <p>The area will feel unsafe during construction</p> <p>The public square will be noisy and polluted</p> <p>No community facilities or amenities offered</p> <p>No public toilets proposed but there are public toilets in the existing market</p>	<p>Provision is not viable. See sections 8.13 and 8.14</p> <p>Substantial amounts of affordable housing are being delivered at other sites in the east of the Borough</p> <p>The site is not considered suitable for high numbers of family sized units</p> <p>This impact must be balanced against the economic and physical regeneration benefits of the scheme</p> <p>Apex house is included in the Brief and is subject to development in the future</p> <p>The s106 ensures that existing residents and businesses will be signposted to existing support services of Haringey Council and traders are given full opportunity to return to the new market</p> <p>Hoarding and lighting will be subject to further approval</p> <p>The square provides more space and planting than the existing public realm, which is used as an amenity space by local people</p> <p>A new public square is provided and there are improvements to the public realm</p> <p>Toilets are provided in the new market in the same way as they are provided in the existing market</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	<p>11 responses have been received in support as of 12:00h 15/06/2012</p> <p>In addition, 102 residents have consented to having their expressions of support on the Grainger website forwarded to the Council</p> <p>A petition of 55 signatures has been submitted in support of the scheme.</p> <p>The Haringey Business Board, North London Business, College of Haringey, Enfield and North East London have all expressed support</p>	<p>The Wards buildings has been empty since 1972 and it is unlikely to be occupied and brought into economic use</p> <p>Provides a mix of retail units which the area needs</p> <p>Creation of temporary and permanent jobs</p> <p>Development is key to regeneration of South Tottenham</p> <p>Private market housing will address the housing balance of the area</p> <p>Market traders will have time and support to relocate and return</p> <p>Will complement the Bernie Grant Centre</p> <p>Will capture spending from THFC supporters around Seven Sisters Station</p> <p>Will improve the image of the local area</p>	<p>All points noted.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response

APPENDIX 2

Planning Policies

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

NATIONAL POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework

REGIONAL PLANNING POLICY

London Plan 2011

- Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity
- Policy 2.14 Areas for Regeneration
- 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

The Mayors Transport Strategy (May 2010)

The Mayor's Land for Transport Functions SPG (March 2007)

The Mayor's Sustainable Design & Construction SPG (2006)

The Mayor's Culture Strategy: Realising the potential of a world class city (2004)

The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy (2004)

The Mayor's Energy Strategy (2004)

The Mayor's Draft Industrial Capacity SPG (2003)

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 Planning for Equality & Diversity in Meeting the Spatial Needs of London's Diverse Communities SPG

The Mayor's Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG

The Mayor and London Councils' Best Practice Guide on the Control of Dust & Emissions during Construction

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (Adopted July 2006; Saved July 2009)

- G1 Environment
- G2 Development and Urban Design
- G4 Employment
- G6 Strategic Transport Links

- G9 Community Well Being
- G10 Conservation
- G12 Priority Areas
- AC3 Tottenham High Road Regeneration Corridor
- UD1 Planning Statements
- UD2 Sustainable Design and Construction
- UD3 General Principles
- UD4 Quality Design
- UD7 Waste Storage
- UD8 Planning Obligations
- ENV1 Flood Protection: Protection of Floodplain, Urban Washlands
- ENV2 Surface Water Runoff
- ENV4 Enhancing and Protecting the Water Environment
- ENV5 Works Affecting Water Courses
- ENV6 Noise Pollution
- ENV7 Air, Water and Light Pollution
- ENV11 Contaminated Land
- ENV13 Sustainable Waste Management
- M2 Public Transport Network
- M3 New Development Location and Accessibility
- M5 Protection, Improvement and Creation of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes
- M8 Access Roads
- M10 Parking for Development
- OS12 Biodiversity
- OS16 Green Chains
- CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas
- CSV3 Locally Listed Buildings and Designated Sites of Industrial Heritage Interest
- CSV7 Demolition in Conservation Areas
- CSV8 Archaeology

Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006)

- SPG1a Design Guidance (Adopted 2006)
- SPG2 Conservation and Archaeology (Draft 2006)
- SPG4 Access for All (Mobility Standards) (Draft 2006)
- SPG5 Safety By Design (Draft 2006)
- SPG7a Vehicle and Pedestrian Movements (Draft 2006)
- SPG7b Travel Plans (Draft 2006)
- SPG7c Transport Assessment (Draft 2006)
- SPG8a Waste and Recycling (Adopted 2006)
- SPG8b Materials (Draft 2006)
- SPG8c Environmental Performance (Draft 2006)
- SPG8d Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees (Draft 2006)
- SPG8e Light Pollution (Draft 2006)
- SPG8f Land Contamination (Draft 2006)

- SPG 8g Ecological Impact Assessment (Draft 2006)
- SPG 8h Environmental Impact Assessment (Draft 2006)
- SPG 8i Air Quality (Draft 2006)
- SPG9 Sustainability Statement Guidance Notes and Checklist (Draft 2006)
- SPG10a Negotiation, Mgt & Monitoring of Planning Obligations (Adopted 2006)
- SPG10d Planning Obligations and Open Space (Draft 2006)
- SPG10e Improvements Public Transport Infrastructure & Services (Draft 2006)
- SPD Housing

Planning Obligation Code of Practice No 1: Employment and Training (Adopted 2006)

Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Proposals Map (Published for Consultation May 2010; Submitted for Examination March 2011. EiP July 2011)

- SP1 Managing Growth
- SP2 Housing
- SP4 Working towards a Low Carbon Haringey
- SP5 Water Management and Flooding
- SP6 Waste and Recycling
- SP7 Transport
- SP8 Employment
- SP9 Imp Skills/Training to Support Access to Jobs/Community Cohesion/Inclusion
- SP10 Town Centres
- SP11 Design
- SP12 Conservation
- SP13 Open Space and Biodiversity
- SP14 Health and Well-Being
- SP15 Culture and Leisure
- SP16 Community Infrastructure

Draft Development Management Policies (Published for Consultation May 2010)

- DMP9 New Development Location and Accessibility
- DMP10 Access Roads
- DMP13 Sustainable Design and Construction
- DMP14 Flood Risk, Water Courses and Water Management
- DMP15 Environmental Protection
- DMP16 Development Within and Outside of Town & Local Shopping Centres
- DMP19 Employment Land & Premises
- DMP20 General Principles

- DMP21 Quality Design
- DMP22 Waste Storage
- DMP25 Haringey's Heritage
- DMP26 Alexandra Palace
- DMP27 Significant Local Open Land & Development Adjacent to Open Spaces
- DMP28 Ecologically Valuable Sites their Corridors and Tree protection

Draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (October 2010)
Haringey's 2nd Local Implementation Plan (Transport Strategy) 2011 – 2031

OTHER DOCUMENTS

CABE Design and Access Statements
Diversity and Equality in Planning: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)
Planning and Access for disabled people: A Good Practice Guide (ODPM)
Demolition Protocol Developed by London Remade
Secured by Design

APPENDIX 3

Development Management Forum Minutes

APPENDIX 4

Not Used

APPENDIX 5

Planning History

Planning History

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. However a full timeline of events showing the development of the scheme 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

- 01/02/2011** Development Management Forum held
- 20/07/2011** Application taken to Planning Committee with recommendation to approve but the application was refused by the committee
- 09/05/2012** Revised scheme received and validated under HGY/2012/0915. Consultation letters sent to statutory consultees, third parties and local residents
- 30/05/2012** Development Management Forum held
- 31/05/2012** Scheme presented to Haringey Design Panel
- 25/06/2012** Application taken to Planning sub-Committee with recommendation to approve

APPENDIX 6

Summary of EqlA impacts and Proposed Responses

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 assured shorthold tenancy housing on site; no guarantee of re-provision on site within new private housing.	A wide range of different ethnicity households living in private rental housing Children in affected households	Site includes new market rent housing, likely to include private rental provision. Recommended mitigation of support, particularly to households with children, to identify suitable alternative housing in the locality	Following granting of planning Permission Site preparation phase	N/A	Mitigation secured through s106
Loss of owner occupied housing on site, including family-sized houses; no guarantee of re-provision on site within new private housing.	Minority ethnic households living in owner-occupied housing, including older people Children in affected households	Recommended mitigation of support, particularly to leaseholders/freeholders who also run businesses on the site, to identify suitable alternative accommodation in the locality, negotiation of purchase and appropriate compensation for losses associated with the move.	This is understood to have been ongoing, but should be monitored by the council following granting of planning permission Site preparation phase	N/A	Mitigation secured through s106
Indirect: Onsite loss of affordable	BME households, lone parent	New affordable housing provision planned within	Over timeframe of site preparation and	Re-provision of affordable housing	N/A Significant number of

housing, exacerbating existing barriers to housing	Households (details according to Haringey HNS 2007)	East Haringey at other site resulting in net increase	construction.	judged unaffordable by Valuation Office.	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 Potential negative impact for equality and for community cohesion (relations between Latin-American people and other ethnic groups)	Latin- American/Hispanic ownership businesses Other diverse ethnicity 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
Interim loss of existing market site during redevelopment, affecting temporary operation of business and long term continuation of businesses	Latin- American/Hispanic ownership businesses Other diverse ethnicity ownership businesses	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 Latin American identity promoted

Potential negative equality impact		Intention to identify single site for all Latin American traders together			in s106 Market Facilitator Package
Break-up of Latin-American market affecting viability of individual stallholder businesses & overall vibrancy. Potential negative equality impact and for community cohesion (relations between Latin-American people and other ethnic groups)	Latin- American/Spanish speaking ownership businesses	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	Following granting of planning permission Site preparation phase	N/A	Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106 Latin American identity promoted in s106 Market Facilitator Package
Loss of employment due to stall business closure / restructure Potential negative equality impact and for community cohesion (relations between Latin-American people and other ethnic groups)	Latin-American/ Hispanic employees Other diverse ethnicity employees	Indirect benefits of mitigation measures directed at businesses	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 of market provided for through s106 Employment support and business advice to stall traders through s106
Loss of shop / business	Diverse ethnicity	Support	Construction Phase	N/A	Provision of

property on site	ownership businesses and shops	Investment in improvements to West Green Road retail environment. Purchase of leasehold/freehold, compensation, support for identifying suitable alternative.	Site preparation phase / construction phase		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 rental/leasehold	BME-ownership shops and Businesses (understood to include Asian, African, Afro-Caribbean and Latin-American owned businesses)	Investment in improvements to West Green Road retail environment. Purchase of leasehold/freehold, compensation, support for identifying suitable alternative. Purchase of leasehold/freehold, compensation, support for identifying suitable alternative.	Construction phase Site preparation phase/construction phase	N/A	West Green Road units intended for local independent traders and promoted as such through s106.
Loss of employment following any closure/restructure of affected shops / businesses	BME Employees	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
<p>Permanent worsening of access to outlets for goods & services specific To race/ethnic/cultural</p> <p>Potential negative equality impact despite proposed mitigation measures</p>	Diverse ethnicity and cultural communities in London	<p>Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders</p> <p>Identification of suitable alternative venues for temporary reprovision of market – possibly within other local existing markets.</p> <p>Variety of alternative suitable retail outlets within wider Seven Sisters / North London</p>	Site preparation phase	N/A	<p>Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.</p> <p>Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106</p> <p>Temporary relocation of market provided for through s106</p>
Permanent worsening of access to outlets for goods & services specific to race/ethnic/cultural groups	Latin-American/Hispanic communities in London	<p>Measures to protect right of return of existing stallholders</p> <p>Identification of suitable alternative venues for temporary reprovision</p>	Ongoing from planning permission granted – site preparation - construction phase – completion Following planning	N/A	<p>Reprovision of market with right of return for existing traders secured through s106</p> <p>Temporary relocation of</p>

Potential negative equality impact despite proposed mitigation measures		of market Intention to identify single site for all Latin American traders together	permission granted – site preparation		market provided for through s106
Temporary worsening of access to outlets for goods & services specific to race/ethnic/cultural identity Potential negative equality impact despite proposed mitigation measures	Latin-American/Spanish-speaking ownership businesses	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 America	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
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.	Construction phase No current contribution to educational provision	Haringey Council Community Infrastructure Levy tariff not yet set. It is understood that the development is not considered viable with additional contributions towards social infrastructure.	Playspace provided in development.
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	Affected	Agreed mitigation	Indicative	Reason why	Response to
-----------	----------	-------------------	------------	------------	-------------

Impact	Group	measures (if any)	timeframe for implementing mitigation measures	mitigation measures not possible	recommendation in planning permission
<p>Worsening community cohesion by displacing predominant BME groups amongst existing residents, shop owners, market traders and employees.</p> <p>Potential negative equality impact for relations between groups where mitigation measures prove inadequate to safeguard majority of Latin American businesses</p>	<p>Latin-American / Hispanic community</p> <p>Afro-Caribbean</p> <p>African</p> <p>Other BME communities</p>	<p>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 effect of such measures on community cohesion would be secondary.</p>	<p>Following planning Permission granted – site preparation continued through to construction and completion</p>	<p>Measures specifically directed at sustaining community cohesion not identified.</p>	<p>S106 securing reprovion and temporary relocation of market and promotion of Latin American identity.</p> <p>Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council control of tenancies.</p>
<p>Loss to cultural connections and social interaction amongst specific community with shared racial identity</p> <p>Potential negative equality impact for relations between groups where mitigation measures prove inadequate to safeguard majority of</p>	<p>Latin-American, including Spanish-speaking people</p>	<p>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 effect of such measures on community cohesion would be indirect.</p>	<p>Following planning Permission granted – site preparation, followed through in construction and completion.</p>	<p>Measures specifically directed at sustaining community cohesion not identified.</p>	<p>S106 securing reprovion and temporary relocation of market and promotion of Latin American identity.</p> <p>Provision of independent retail units in scheme. West Green Road Improvement Fund in s106 promotes independent trading and gives Council</p>

Latin American businesses					control of tenancies.
Threat to ethnic diversity of area associated with multi-ethnic mix of existing market where mitigation measures prove inadequate to enable majority of existing businesses to continue to operate.	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 reprovion 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 contributes to addressing crime levels and fear of crime associated with the site	BME people, women, young people (both men and women), children, older people, lesbian, gay & bisexual people, disabled people.	Active, overlooked frontages in new development. New public realm designed with consideration of security.	Completed development	N/A	Condition requiring details of 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 and Engagement 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 diversity and different interest groups to contribute towards sharing of benefits of	All equality groups, including BME residents, employees & business owners, visitors & customers.	Approach to date has included variety of means of consultation. Recommend urgent revisit of consultation & Engagement approach to respond to criticisms	Following decision on Planning Application – as a matter of urgency	N/A	S106 provision for Community Engagement Strategy to improve consultation with local community following approval

regeneration.		of not listening, quality of consultation and to address long gap in engagement			
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. Benefits and how they may be shared

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-care, particularly	National strategies to tackle child care affordability offer some help e.g. child care element of working tax credits.	Valuation Office identifies development as unable to afford inclusion of affordable housing	Assistance for existing council and private residents/owner occupiers provided through s106

		affecting women in low to middle-income employment.	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.	N/A	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	Older people and some disabled people;	Fear of crime, including hate crime, or antisocial	Effective communication of new	N/A	Community Engagement Strategy

opportunities for crime and make for safer environment	women, especially from certain faith groups (e.g. Muslim) or racial groups; children; some young people.	behaviour, may prevent individuals from amongst these groups venturing out or lead them to avoid area, based on past experience/reputation	safety measures, effective targeting of communications at key groups		in s106
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.	Risk that proposed mitigation measures may not be adequate to achieve sharing of benefits.	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	Risk that proposed mitigation measures may not be adequate to achieve sharing of benefits.	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	N/A	Development and implementation of travel plan in s106
New play space	Disabled children	Construction of non-inclusive play equipment may exclude	Use of inclusive play equipment / construction to London Play standards	N/A	Details of playspace secured by condition

APPENDIX 7

EqIA prepared by URS Scott Wilson

APPENDIX 8

Summary of previous GLA reports

Summary of previous GLA reports

The previous scheme had been referred to the GLA on two occasions and they did not object to the scheme subject to conditions. The previous reports are summarised below.

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 a new public square.

The internal layout of the proposed flats is acceptable.

The architectural approach is on the whole welcomed, 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.

APPENDIX 9

Court of Appeal Judgement

APPENDIX 10

Wards Corner/Seven Sisters Underground Development Brief